

Competition and Conflict: Ludic Structures and Strategies in Late Medieval Iberian Romance

By

Copyright 2014

Michael Patrick O'Brien Jr.

Submitted to the graduate degree program in The Department of Spanish and Portuguese and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Chairperson, Isidro Rivera

Patricia Manning

Robert Bayliss

Jonathan Mayhew

Benjamin Sax

Date Defended: April 11th, 2014

The Dissertation Committee for Michael Patrick O'Brien Jr.
certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

Competition and Conflict: Ludic Structures and Strategies in Late Medieval Iberian Romance

Chairperson, Isidro Rivera

Date approved: April 18th, 2014

Abstract

The current dissertation analyzes the ludic foundations of the conflictive moments found within Juan Rodríguez del Padrón's *Siervo libre de amor*, Juan de Flores' *Grimalte y Gradissa*, Diego de San Pedro's *Cárcel de amor*, and Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo's *Amadís de Gaula*. Building on the notion that there is a special reciprocal bond between the concepts of conflict and play, I assert that this binary phenomenon forms the foundation of the Sentimental and Chivalric sub-genres of late medieval Iberia, thus requiring a reclassification of the works under a ludic fiction category. My analysis draws from multiple twentieth and twenty-first century theories on conflict and play in order to analyze plot creation, character motivation and interaction, as well as authorial messaging. My approach attempts to situate the works not only in recent debates about the boundaries and limitations of both sub-genres, but also within the socio-cultural framework of late fifteenth-century Iberia.

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I would like to thank Dr. Isidro J. Rivera for all of his support and suggestions during the writing of this dissertation. I have benefitted greatly from his guidance and encouragement throughout my graduate studies and I am forever grateful for the vast amount of time and effort that he has invested in helping me pursue my goals. I would also like to thank Dr. Patricia Manning and Dr. Robert Bayliss, not only for their advice related to this dissertation, but for their continuous support and encouragement over the past several years. I am also grateful to Dr. Jonathan Mayhew and Dr. Benjamin Sax for serving on my dissertation committee and providing me with wonderful suggestions and insight into my dissertation topic. I am thankful for the help of all of the faculty and staff in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese, and to all of the professors, both at The University of Kansas and elsewhere, who have allowed me to explore my interests and grow professionally. Finally, I want to thank my family and friends. I am especially grateful to my wife, Nahir, for her continuous support and encouragement throughout this entire process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Chapter One: Ludic Foundations of <i>Siervo libre de amor</i>	19
Chapter Two: Gradissa's Challenge: Play and Games in Juan de Flores' <i>Grimalte y Gradissa</i>	84
Chapter Three: Playing the Game: Strategic Positioning in <i>Cárcel de amor</i>	129
Chapter Four: Performance and Play in <i>Amadís de Gaula</i>	184
Conclusion.....	232
Works Cited.....	241

INTRODUCTION

Throughout the majority of the fifteenth-century, Castile was ruled by three consecutive individuals from the Trastamaran dynasty: Juan II (1418-1454), Enrique IV (1454-1474), and Isabel I (1474-1504). In addition to being immediate family members, these three monarchs share a common bond due to the presence of competition and conflict during their respective reigns. Juan II assumed the throne upon his mother's death in 1418 and his care and upbringing caused a clash of wills between several parties vying for control of the young monarch, as "Castile became a battlefield for the ambitions of these political players" (Ruiz, *Spain's Centuries* 88). Even after maturing into his role as king, Juan II's reliance on his controversial favorite, Don Álvaro de Luna, caused further turmoil as the latter "faced widespread noble rebellions throughout the realm" (Ruiz, *Spain's Centuries* 92). Assuming the throne in 1454 upon his father's death, Enrique IV also saw his share of conflict throughout his reign due to continued claims to the throne by his half-brother Alfonso. Even after Alfonso's sudden death, Enrique IV was faced with conflict due to his half-sister Isabel's own claims to the throne. The ensuing civil wars caused by issues of succession split the kingdom into two factions with each supporting a different woman as heir to the throne. The first group backed Isabel, while the second placed their hope in Enrique IV's daughter Juana de Castilla, commonly called "La Beltraneja". This dispute led to armed encounters and all-out civil war, even bringing Portugal

and France into the matter as well. Isabel de Castilla was named heir to the throne in 1468, and by 1480, Juana La Beltraneja had withdrawn to a convent in Portugal. This situation left Isabel, along with her husband Fernando, “in a position to make far-reaching decisions on matters of state” (Kamen 1-3). Although Isabel had won the struggle for succession, her reign was also marked by war and conflict, albeit mainly in the south. Referencing the subsequent aftermath of the struggles for succession, Henry Kamen asserts that, “Immediately after consolidating their authority the monarchs turned their attention to Granada” (34). The campaign against the south “was full of episodes in which the gallantry and chivalry of combatants reflected the best ideals of mediaeval warfare” (Kamen 35). Whether through inter-family struggles, tensions with nobles, or direct combat against a foreign enemy, each of these Castilian monarchs had ample experience with their own version of conflict.

Given the competitive and often bellicose nature of fifteenth-century Iberian interactions, one could easily overlook the fact that interspersed throughout the tension and violence appeared numerous festivals and celebrations. While no doubt entertaining, it is important to remember, as Teofilo Ruiz points out, that many festivities and celebrations were also, “indispensable parts of the complex mechanisms by which kings did eventually overcome noble resistance and gained or forced their collaboration with, and obedience to, royal authority” (*Spain’s Centuries* 115). In other words, the festivities themselves were often times a mere continuation of the recently described struggle between the nobility and the crown. Considering the strategic and self-serving nature of hosting such events, perhaps it is fitting that many of these public proceedings also showcased competitive behavior in the form of tournaments and mock battles. Ruiz discusses how in 1428 “a fantastic artificial castle was built” (*Spain’s Centuries* 188) during festivities in Valladolid, which served as a staging ground for tournament related activity. Fernán Pérez de

Guzmán indicates that in addition to the castle, a tower of similar style was also built at this event, and that men were assigned to both structures (Pérez de Guzmán, *Crónicas* 446). A bell was placed above the castle's entrance, which the men from the tower were encouraged to ring to indicate the number of jousts they wished to have with the castle's defenders (Pérez de Guzmán, *Crónicas* 446). While this was no doubt all in good fun, it is worth noting how this celebration relied on mock battles and competitive behavior to create an entertaining experience.

Unfortunately, the competitive nature of the 1428 celebration must have quickly gotten out of control for Pérez de Guzmán claims that the jousts led to the death of a participant: "En esta justa se hicieron muchos é muy señalados encuentros, é morió en ella Gutierre de Sandoval, sobrino del Conde de Castro, de un encuentro muy grande que le fué dado por un Caballero de los mantenedores" (*Crónicas* 446). In effect, Gutierre de Sandoval died while engaged in a playful recreational challenge. The fact that a man died in the midst of such an elaborately staged celebratory encounter shows how the lines between violent competition and playful activity can easily become blurred.

Although not nearly as tragic as the 1428 incident at Valladolid, the case of the constable Miguel Lucas de Iranzo is another example of competitive bellicose behavior appropriated for the purpose of celebration and play. In his article entitled, "Elite and Popular Culture in Late Fifteenth-Century Castilian Festivals: The Case of Jaén," Ruiz describes how in 1461 Miguel Lucas de Iranzo "sponsored, supervised, and participated in a bizarre egg battle in which, according the chronicle, between nine thousand and ten thousand eggs were spent" (314). Ruiz highlights other mock battles fought with eggs and some with dried pumpkins as well ("Elite" 314). Like the fake castle and tournament competition in Valladolid, these fun-filled moments in Jaén also mimic real world-violence for the sake of having a good time. The competitive and

violent nature of war was once again interwoven into lighter, more ludic forms of entertainment during these decadent food fights funded by the elite.

The two anecdotes from Valladolid and Jaén highlight the fact that there is a special bond between competitive behavior and the concept of play, an idea which will be developed at length throughout the current dissertation and which will be the driving force behind my overall analysis. The two ideas of competition and play would seem to blend together quite seamlessly, at least in the minds of those that participated in mock battles and tournaments. Furthermore, competition and play can often times have a reciprocal relationship since not only can playful activities draw inspiration from competitive scenarios like war, but the reverse is true as well; situations of conflict can often times resemble, and even rely upon, playful and game-like behavior. In his seminal work *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play Element in Culture*, Johan Huizinga draws strong connections between competition and play by stating, “We can well say that an essential part of the play-concept is concealed in the field of operation of the *agon*” (*Homo Ludens* 49).¹ Even when competition develops into all-out war, Huizinga continues to see its playful origins and associations:

Ever since words existed for fighting and playing, men have been wont to call war a game...The two ideas often seem to blend absolutely in the archaic mind. Indeed, all fighting that is bound by rules bears the formal characteristics of play by that very limitation. We can call it the most intense, the most energetic form of play and at the same time the most palpable and primitive. (*Homo Ludens* 110).

¹ Huizinga explains that *agon* is the Greek term for competition (*Homo Ludens* 49).

Acknowledging and building upon the unique bond which exists between competition and play, the current thesis explores how this binary phenomenon manifests itself in the literary production of late medieval Castile. The analysis will uncover how the competition/play relationship influences authors, readers, and characters in diverse manners, and what its pervasive presence in certain late medieval texts indicates about larger social concerns and realities.

While it may be possible to explore the combined presence of competition and play using a variety of late medieval genres and texts, I have chosen to focus specifically on the Sentimental and Chivalric sub-genres. The boundaries and definitions of both genres is an ongoing debate amongst medieval Hispanists. While opinions vary on what comprises the Sentimental novel, some general characteristics which have been cited and disputed include the presence of “courtly love, autobiographical and self-conscious point of view, incorporation of lyrics, epistles, and debate, metafiction and intertextuality, tragic ending, psychological analysis” (Weissberger, “The Gendered” 206). The Iberian Chivalric genre owes much to Arthuric legends and in general terms, Susana Gil-Albarellos describes the genre in the following manner:

Las novelas de caballerías en España reproducen, en general, las aventuras de un gran caballero que sale de su lugar habitual de residencia para vivir diversas aventuras. Se trata, pues, de un relato estructurado a través del viaje emprendido por el protagonista que consiste en la vivencia y resolución de las diversas dificultades que encuentra a su paso y el conocimiento de los diversos personajes con los que coincide en el camino. La idea del viaje, unida íntimamente a la idea de búsqueda, es esencial en todos los relatos caballerescos, y viene provocada por diversos motivos: la búsqueda del amor, expresado en códigos corteses y estrechamente relacionada con la aventura. Cabría añadir las modificaciones hacia lo religioso o hacia lo pastoril-por poner dos de los ejemplos más

significativos-, que tienen lugar en alguna de las novelas más representativas del género.

(42)

Drawing from these two sub-genres, I have chosen to focus on four specific texts: Juan Rodríguez del Padrón's *Siervo libre de amor* (henceforth *Sla*), Juan de Flores' *Grimalte y Gradissa* (henceforth *GyG*), Diego de San Pedro's *Cárcel de amor* (henceforth *Cda*), and Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo's *Amadís de Gaula* (henceforth *AdG*).

The thought process behind the selection of these texts is fairly straightforward. Each text, in its own way, contains multiple examples of characters engaged in competitive and conflictive situations. If the special competition/play phenomenon does figure prominently in any fifteenth-century texts, then these works, replete with examples of amorous and physical conflict, are an appropriate and logical place to start my analysis. In part, the selection of these texts is also attributable to their unique and varied levels of fame and distinction. *Sla* is often considered the first example of the *novela sentimental*, while *GyG* is a well-established representative of the genre. San Pedro's *Cda* is ranked among the most popular Sentimental works, and *AdG* is perhaps the most well-known Chivalric text to have been produced on the Iberian Peninsula. Additionally, I have chosen both Sentimental and Chivalric sub-genres not only due to their close relationship with each other, but more importantly to show that the play/competition phenomenon can manifest itself in moments of physical hand to hand combat as easily as it can in amorous confrontations.

In general terms, identifying traces of play and games interlaced with harsh competition in late medieval society has already been addressed by Huizinga from a broad European perspective. In *The Autumn of the Middle Ages*, Huizinga claims that it was the difficult social

reality of the Middle Ages which created a predilection for play among European nobility. Huizinga describes the later Middle Ages as a time “in which the cultural life of the higher circles has become, almost in its entirety, social play. Reality is crass, hard, and cruel; one turns back to the beautiful dream of the knightly ideal and builds the game of life on this foundation. One plays masked as Lancelot” (*The Autumn* 85). Life was not only “harsh” due to the competitive and violent nature of politics among the elite, but also, as Huizinga explains, due to a more general pervasive sense of despair: “Towards the end of the Middle Ages the ground tone underlying life is one of bitter despondency” (*The Autumn* 30). Huizinga goes on to state that there “is not only weariness with the world, but also an actual dread of life, a fearful shrinking away because of life’s inevitable suffering” (*The Autumn* 35). This bleak outlook on life is also noted by Joseph F. O’Callaghan as he describes Castile at the end of Juan II’s reign: “Castile lay improvident, her government in ruins, her people divided, and her future prospects dim indeed” (566). In his work, *Spain’s Centuries of Crisis: 1300-1474*, Teofilo Ruiz’s own historical discussion about the difficult realities of late medieval Iberia lead him to briefly consider Huizinga’s views from an Iberian perspective:

It might not be improper to invoke Johannes Huizinga’s *The Autumn of the Middle Ages* and to see Spanish history in the late Middle Ages through Huizinga’s explanatory scheme: a society plagued by endemic and horrific violence and by a morbid pursuit of fame and remembrance, yet capable of generating artistic works of rare beauty. In this world, through romance, festivals, and knight-errantry, the upper groups in society constructed the life beautiful: one in which life imitated art and vice versa; one in which aesthetic pursuits stood as a bulwark against the unbearable transformations of medieval life and institutions. (29)

While Ruiz's work focuses primarily on the historical realities present in late medieval Iberia, he does dedicate a later chapter to a brief panoramic view of the cultural production which sprang forth in the midst of such a tumultuous time period. In addition to touching on issues of language, education, religion, love, festivals, knight-errantry and poetry, Ruiz also mentions the appearance of Courtly Romances, the category of texts at the center of the current dissertation: "The fifteenth-century witnessed the composition, and enactment of, elaborate courtly romances. A culture of chivalry, of romance, of devotion to the lady thrived in the Iberian royal courts, as it did elsewhere in the medieval West" (193).² The Courtly Romances, both the Sentimental and Chivalric variety, have been the subject of numerous studies for well over a century, covering a vast array of topics, themes, and theories. Among these areas of investigation, the topic of conflict in one permutation or another has arisen quite frequently. However, a full discussion of the unique competition/play phenomenon found throughout the Iberian Courtly Romances has yet to be completely undertaken. In order to uncover the simultaneous competitive/ludic nature of the texts under consideration in the current thesis, it will be necessary to begin with a brief discussion about both sub-genres' more noticeable and more readily acknowledged association with conflict and competition in general.

To suggest that Chivalric texts contain some level of competition and conflict may be stating the obvious considering that the subject matter deals with knights battling each other for fame, honor, and love. As Harry Sieber states in his discussion about Romances of Chivalry in Spain, "the chivalric enterprise was centered on honor, valor, strength in battle, and defense of king and kingdom" (214). While it may be safe to momentarily take the competitive nature of

² While Hispano-medievalists have traditionally divided the Sentimental and Chivalric genres into two distinct categories, both Alan Deyermond and Barbara Weissberger have called for their unification under the more general heading of "romance". See Deyermond, "The Lost Genre of Medieval Spanish Literature", and Weissberger, "The Gendered Taxonomy". Additionally, see Vicenta Blay Manzanera, "La convergencia".

knightly activity as a given, highlighting the conflictive nature of the Sentimental sub-genre may require a further explanation. Traditionally, Sentimental texts have been described in terms of “their emphasis on psychological interiority and their insistent portrayal of madness, uncertainty, and the sufferings of love” (Gerli, *Studies* xiii). As the subsequent chapters of this dissertation will show, these “sufferings of love” often lead to intense levels of conflict and competition between characters in a text. However, in addition to displays of love and emotion by characters, E. Michael Gerli explains that Sentimental works also “generate a tension at the level of the text that ensues from a clash between disparate discursive practices and the limitations of language to represent adequately the reality it wishes to convey” (*Studies* xiv). Therefore, these texts not only present situations of conflict between characters, but they represent a larger notion of conflict at the discursive level. With the use of words like “tension” and “clash”, this description of Sentimental texts would seem to situate them quite appropriately in the general milieu of the previously described conflict and crisis present in late medieval Iberia. In fact, Gerli suggests that such tension in the Sentimental sub-genre is attributable to what authors witnessed at court: “Compounded by their heightened awareness and persistent exposure to the treachery of language at court, this tendency led them to thematicize and make the failure of the communicative act the recurring, dominant action of their works” (*Studies* xvi). Words like “treachery of language”, “tension”, and “clash”, begin to paint a picture of the Sentimental sub-genre as having strong ties to the concept of conflict.

And yet, despite the intensity and serious subject matter of the *novela sentimental*, scholars have more recently begun to detect the playful ludic side of these works in the form of parody, irony, and comedy. Dorothy Severin has discussed parody of religious themes while Barbara Weissberger has detected comical reversals of gender roles which subvert male-

dominated society. Regula Rohland de Langbehn has attributed to Weissberger the validation of the “dimensiones lúdicas como fundamento de la interpretación” (125) of the Sentimental sub-genre. While discussing irony and comedy are crucial first steps to uncovering the full ludic nature of Sentimental (and Chivalric) fiction, I posit that our understanding of both sub-genres would benefit greatly from recognizing that the concept of play is not solely limited to a late medieval author’s tongue-in-cheek social criticism, or even to the presence of fun-filled courtly games, but instead reaches even deeper into many facets of human existence and social interaction, particularly into the area of competition. Play is present in a variety of competitive activities: whether emotional or physical, free or coercive, strategic or spontaneous. The dual competition/play sensation can be found in activities ranging from a child’s game to a heated battle between two armies, or, as the current thesis will demonstrate, even within the pages of a late medieval Iberian text.

While my focus throughout the dissertation will be on play’s special relationship with competition, this does not mean to imply that play cannot bond itself to other areas of human behavior. Huizinga has discussed play’s influence in several areas of human civilization and culture in *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play Element in Culture*. In that text, Huizinga explains that in addition to competition and war, play has influenced broad areas of civilization such as law, philosophy, art, and allegory. Huizinga states: “It is through this playing that society expresses its interpretation of life and the world” (*Homo Ludens* 66). For Huizinga, the concept of play is present at the very core and foundation of human society. For other play theorists, like Jacques Ehrmann, play is not so much a precursor to human society as much as it is co-equal with that society: “Play, reality, culture are synonymous and interchangeable” (*Homo Ludens Revisted* 56). Still others, like Eugen Fink, link play with mankind’s very existence: “Play is an

essential element of man's ontological makeup, a basic existential phenomenon" (19).

Approaches to play are varied and cover wide-ranging areas of psychological and social development. Invariably, some of these additional areas influenced by play will be touched upon throughout the current project, but always in relation to, or seen as outgrowths of, the central theme of the competition/play hypothesis. What is important to note about all of the recently mentioned views is that each one sees the play phenomenon as being inextricably bound and intertwined with other areas often not associated with the play concept. Nearly none of the approaches to play simply relegate it to an inconsequential child-like activity, but rather view play and ludic activity as influencing important aspects of the human experience. When we broaden our understanding of the term play, and acknowledge it as a concept or phenomenon intimately bound to numerous areas of human behavior, it becomes easier to see how ludic concepts and influences are present at multiple levels of many medieval Iberian texts.

With play taking such a comprehensive role in human society, it should be no surprise that traces of play have also made their way into the realm of literature as well. Play and games have often had a prominent role in literature. Spariosu claims that literature "has always been regarded, in our culture, as a «higher» or a «lower» form of play" ("Literature" k2). Sutton-Smith also elaborates on the traditional connections between literature and play by asserting: "The broad view that all literary writing is play has for centuries generated discussion among poets and philosophers, and, more recently, among cultural historians and psychoanalysts (*The Ambiguity* 136). Specifically, in her work, *The Game of Love: Troubadour Wordplay*, Laura Kendrick traces the origins of playful writing during the Middle Ages to Guillaume IX, Duke of Aquitaine, and his group of troubadours known as the *scola neblo* who, "parodied the religious school situation of textual interpretation" (16). On the Iberian Peninsula, Juan II was also known

to have found pleasure in poetry and word play: “He liked books and stories a great deal. He took great pleasure in listening to poems and he was a good critic of them. He delighted in hearing pleasant thoughts well expressed, and even he himself knew how to turn a good phrase” (Pérez de Guzman, *Pen Portraits* 53). According to scholars such as Ian Macpherson (101) and Ana Menéndez Collera (426), Isabel de Castilla was also accustomed to literary play and games at her court. While the majority of literary play seems centered on poetic games and love poetry, it is worth noting that the same nobles and courtiers that enjoyed, and wrote poetry, were the very same individuals reading and writing Iberian Romances. E. Michael Gerli suggests that the authors of Sentimental Romance “all fancied themselves to be courtier-poets” (“Señora” 248). Furthermore, Macpherson claims: “The play element-love is a game, poetry is a game” (97) was a reality during the reign of the Catholic Monarchs, and scholars such as Boase have readily identified Courtly Love as a game in more general terms. If the same writers creating playful love poetry were the same individuals reading and writing the Iberian Romances as Gerli suggests, then it should not be far-fetched or overreaching to suggest the possibility that the Romances themselves are also steeped in a deep sense of the ludic.

With the premise that play tightly entangled with the idea of competition is, in fact, a central component of the Iberian Romances, I begin the dissertation with chapter one, focusing on Juan Rodríguez del Padrón’s *Sla*. Appearing during the reign of Juan II, and considered the first example of the Sentimental sub-genre, much of the scholarship on this work has centered on its completeness, as well as the author’s possible intentions. My purpose, however, is to highlight that both competition and play are fundamental and interdependent components of the text. The description of the plot is fairly straightforward. After angering his beloved, and arguing with an allegorical representation of *Amor*, the narrator recalls the love story of prince Ardanlyer and

Lyessa who defy the wishes of King Creos and marry, fleeing the kingdom of Mondoya in the process. The King eventually tracks the couple down and kills Lyessa and her unborn child, leading Ardanlyer to commit suicide. The narrator awakens from this memory to discover that he must leave behind terrestrial passion and seek comfort in other pursuits. While the description of the work is seemingly devoid of any overt playful activity, there is, however, quite a bit of competition. I suggest that Rodríguez del Padrón's message is that Courtly Love, like a complex game, is much too competitive and that engaging in such behavior will only lead to the downfall of the reader. I assert that in order for Rodríguez del Padrón to deliver his message he relies upon four elements strongly grounded in play, which I term the four ludic pillars of the text. These ludic pillars include: allegory, poetry, myth, and strategy. Rodríguez del Padrón turns to each of these play-inspired components in order to emphasize the competitive nature of Courtly Love, thus demonstrating that the unique competition/play experience can be discovered at the core of this text.

After establishing allegory's deep ties to play, I explore how Rodríguez del Padrón uses allegorical figures and topography in order to create a literary challenge or game for his readers. If successful at navigating this allegorical world, the reader can attain his or her prize, which is the knowledge that amorous game-play will eventually consume all those who attempt to participate. I then demonstrate how Rodríguez del Padrón relies on poetry, a literary genre with its own special connection to play, to develop an agonistic war of words between his narrator and the allegorical character named *Amor*; further proof that Courtly Love is a hostile activity. Later I address Rodríguez del Padrón's extensive description of an elaborate myth, which he includes to explain the origins of an Iberian city. Ardanlyer and Lyessa's tombs turn into a site of challenges, tournaments, celebrations, holidays, and eventually into a fully developed city,

demonstrating how all of society is built upon a combination of competitive and ludic events. I conclude the chapter with a closer look at the story of Ardanlyer and Lyessa and analyze the prince's interaction with his father by relying on a modified version of Game Theory. This helps to underscore how each character acts as though a player in a game, relying on strategic decision-making in order to win against his opponent.

Continuing my search for the competition/play phenomenon at the center of Iberian Romance, I turn in chapter two to an analysis of Juan de Flores' *GyG*. From the beginning, the plot establishes a game-like competition with a clear prize for the victor. After a reading of Boccaccio's *Elegia di Madonna Fiammetta*, Gradissa orders Grimalte to reunite the two lovers from the story if he ever wishes to win her love. This presents Grimalte with a series of increasingly complex trials which ultimately send him half-way around the world in pursuit of Pánfilo, who flees after Fiometa commits suicide. Grimalte eventually takes pity on Pánfilo and ultimately fails to win the love of Gradissa. I suggest that like Rodríguez del Padrón, Flores has established that any competitive behavior connected to the game of Courtly Love is bound to set the participant up for failure. I assert that Flores successfully delivers this message about the dangers of Courtly Love-play by presenting characters whose words and actions find strong affinity with the concept of play and games, thus showing once again the competition/play combination at work in the Sentimental sub-genre. I present several events and themes in the text with solid ties to play in order to support this claim.

The chapter begins by taking a closer look at how Flores presents a series of textual scenarios which I consider simultaneously playful for both characters and readers alike. However, while readers enjoy these events thanks to the knowledge that the text is fiction, I propose that the characters suffer through these game-like moments solely for the prize that they

hope to attain. This approach builds on Brian Sutton-Smith's contention that play can be both voluntary and "coercive" (52). In order to demonstrate how the same event can be experienced in two distinct ways, I turn to Michael J. Apter's modified version of Reversal Theory. Apter discusses several categories of triggers which initiate moments of arousal, and he explains how each of these instances can be seen as either playful or serious depending on the person's perception of the event. He adds that even serious events can have a game-like quality to them when a prize is at stake. After discussing several of these two-tiered ludic scenarios, I close my analysis by underscoring the ties between Roger Caillois' four game categories and four distinct themes which recur throughout Flores's text: competition, chance, mimicry, andilinx. Although *GyG* is filled with emotional angst, tears, and difficult trials, the analysis makes clear that the competition/play amalgamation is at the center of the work.

Chapter three continues to reinforce the theory that competition and play are an integral part of Sentimental fiction by demonstrating its presence in Diego de San Pedro's *Cda*. Published during the reign of Isabel and Fernando, the work is one of the most well-known examples of the genre. Set in the kingdom of Macedonia, the text opens with Leriano, the son of a powerful duke, wallowing in a world of allegorical captivity due to a rejection by the princess Laureola. Leriano catches the eye of a traveler named Auctor, on his way back home to the Iberian Peninsula, who agrees to help Leriano and serves as an intermediary between the young noble and the princess. The Auctor's efforts and Leriano's presumptions lead to false accusations about an inappropriate relationship, the imprisonment of Laureola, and the eventual need for Leriano to rescue her through a military attack on the King's men. Despite all of his efforts, Leriano dies due to Laureola's unrequited love. As I do with the works presented in chapters one and two, I suggest that San Pedro's text is built upon competition and play, and that the ultimate

message is once again that excessive participation in the Game of Love will lead to the downfall of the player. However, unlike the direct conflict and challenges presented in chapters one and two of this dissertation, I suggest that *Cda* contains a much more developed and intricate sense of competition, which manifests itself largely in characters' reliance upon strategic positioning against their opponents. I view this more strategic thinking as a chess-like game between characters, thus showing the underlying ludic ingredients of the text.

In order to uncover the strategic inner-workings of character interaction in San Pedro's work, I return to a modified version of Game Theory, first presented in chapter one, in order to analyze six specific scenarios in the text. I liken each of these scenarios to moves on a chessboard as I explore each character's strategies and likely calculations before they act. The analysis reveals that while most characters are quite good at strategizing, they often miss the mark by not realizing the type of game that they are playing at any given moment. While most seem to think that they are in a cooperative scenario with other players working toward a similar goal, the reality is much harsher, with opponents playing to win at the expense of all others. This leads to my conclusion that San Pedro utilizes concepts of competition and game-play in order to highlight the dangers and harsh reality of Courtly Love behavior.

Having established the competition/play relationship as a central component of three well-known Sentimental texts in the first three chapters, the fourth chapter explores this same concept in Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo's *AdG*, one of the most famous Chivalric works written during the reign of the Catholic Monarchs. This four-part work chronicles the life and deeds of Amadís as he battles his way across the courts of Europe and demonstrates his love for the princess Oriana. My analysis builds upon the notion that knightly deeds are a form of competitive performance with strong ties to the play concept. Unlike the ominous warnings

about excessive play which I propose are present in the Sentimental sub-genre, I suggest that this Chivalric text ultimately condones such playful behavior since it can clearly lead a successful knight to honor and prestige.

After briefly exploring Performance Theory's general acceptance of the nexus between performance and play, I identify three play categories into which many competitive knightly performances and encounters can be placed: secretive play, competitive play, and deep play. I borrow these categories from a combination of theorists, most notably Johan Huizinga, Roger Caillois, Richard Schechner, and Diane Ackerman, and develop them within a chivalric context. My exploration of secretive play involves the multitude of disguised or undercover competitive activities found throughout the text, as well as a discussion about the ludic motivations for engaging in such behavior. My discussion of the competitive play category involves the more overt and intentionally organized contests and challenges which take place between knights throughout *AdG*. As demonstrated in previous chapters, this competitive behavior creates a game-like atmosphere at several moments throughout the text. The third category builds on Ackerman's notion of "deep play", or an understanding that certain ludic activities have a "transcendental" (12) quality to them, which go beyond a search for fame and recognition that comes with winning against an opponent, and instead answer a deeper call for more intimate, and in some cases, more spiritual experiences. These moments of "deep play" often involve individual thrill seeking as well as ceremonial and religious behavior. There are many "transcendental" performances in Montalvo's text ranging from knighting ceremonies, to battles against magic. Although less game-like in nature, these "transcendental" performances continue to have strong links to the play concept, and in the case of Amadís, always seem to relate back to his competitive and bellicose behavior. By presenting several episodes in each category, I

demonstrate how some of the most important events in Montalvo's work are ultimately sustained by the competition/play relationship.

Bringing together the Sentimental and Chivalric sub-genres, the current project establishes that the special reciprocal bond which exists between competition and play comprises the core of Iberian Romances. While each work, and sub-genre, possesses its own brilliant corpus of existent criticism and scholarship, the presence of a fundamental competitive/ludic combination in each work indicates the need to revisit these texts from a renewed perspective. I approach these varied literary creations as part of a ludic fiction category since such a classification would not only acknowledge the central competition/play phenomenon clearly present in these works, but would also facilitate our understanding of these texts as cultural products of a society such as the one described by Huizinga, full of angst and competition on the one hand, and beautiful idealized play on the other. More specifically, such a reclassification would more accurately reflect fifteenth-century Iberia which was often mired in conflict yet quick to partake in elaborate celebrations and festivities. Like the very ebb and flow of conflict and celebration seen during the reigns of Juan II, Enrique IV, and Isabel I, these Iberian Romances indicate that late medieval Iberian society was reliant on a symbiotic relationship between competition and play, each distinct in their own way, yet so intertwined and interdependent that it could often be difficult to distinguish the boundaries of each. Finally, acknowledging both competition and play as the foundation of Iberian Romance will allow a vast array of disparate ideas and opinions about both sub-genres to intersect more fluidly and in new and exciting ways. This would provide a common thread between the sub-genres but allow individual unique characteristics to remain in place, and perhaps even be seen as outgrowths of the shared common denominator of competition and play.

CHAPTER ONE: LUDIC FOUNDATIONS OF *SIERVO LIBRE DE AMOR*

Juan Rodríguez del Padrón's *Siervo libre de amor* (henceforth *Sla*) begins with a first person account of the narrator, Johan Rodríguez del Padrón, who writes to Gonçalo de Medina, juez de Mondoñedo, about his amorous experience with a woman.³ The narrator explains that after falling in love, he naively confides this truth to a friend, asking him to serve as an intermediary between the two. The friend is less than honorable, and repeats private details told to him in confidence. This sparks the woman's anger, leading her to reject the narrator outright. Devastated by this turn of events the narrative voice turns inward to explore and debate his reality with allegorical representations of his thoughts and feelings. All of these personified emotions and mental capacities help guide the narrator through an allegorical sylvan landscape and eventually down the correct path of reason, symbolized in the story by the olive tree.

The narrator is finally convinced to choose the path of reason after briefly recalling the fatal outcome of the two lovers named Ardanlyer and Lyessa. Structurally, this particular memory functions as an intercalated narrative within the text and it is entitled, *Estoria de dos amadores*. It is a short tale describing the fate of Ardanlyer, son of King Creos of Mondoya, and Lyessa, a noble woman, who defy the King's wishes, marry, and flee the kingdom. King Creos,

³ All references will refer to Antonio Prieto's edition of the work.

angered by this decision, searches for them for several years and upon discovering their whereabouts, proceeds to kill Lyessa and her unborn child. This prompts Ardanlyer to commit suicide and he arranges to have his story publicized throughout the courts of Europe. Upon recalling the consequences of this tale, the narrator appears convinced that he should, in fact, return to the path of reason.

For many Hispanists, *Sla* holds the distinction of being the first example of the genre known as the *novela sentimental*.⁴ Literary historians differ on the exact date of composition, but generally, it is believed that Rodríguez del Padrón wrote his work in the first half of the fifteenth-century during the reign of Juan II. While little evidence physically places Rodríguez del Padrón at Juan II's court, Antonio Prieto posits that the fifteenth-century author may well have been there as he developed another text, *Triunfo de las donas*: “*El Triunfo de las donas* pertenece al apogeo cortesano de Rodríguez del Padrón, que posiblemente se deslizara en la corte de Juan II” (16).⁵ Prieto also states that, “Como pariente del futuro cardenal Cervantes sería bien acogido en la corte” (17). Furthermore, Prieto explains that Rodríguez del Padrón's supposed visit to Juan II's court served as the basis for an amorous legend which surfaced and formed around his name: “Cabe suponer que en este ambiente palaciego tuviera lugar la aventura amorosa (real o imaginada) que se desprende de algunas poesías y del *Siervo*” (17). While Rodríguez del Padrón clearly wrote during the reign of Juan II, Prieto's observations suggest the possibility of his physical presence at the king's court as well.

⁴ In contrast to the traditional view of *Sla* being the first Sentimental novel, Marina Scordilis Brownlee asserts that, “the *Siervo*—rather than being the first manifestation of the new novelistic subgenre known as *novela sentimental*—belongs, in fact, to the tradition of the erotic pseudoautobiography” (642).

⁵ According to Olga Tudorica Impey, “Juan Rodríguez was born in Galicia at the end of the fourteenth-century. As a *hidalgo*, he was very attached to traditional medieval values. As a poet, he was bound to the Galician lyrical legacy of Macías's poetry, and to the European tradition of courtly love (305).

Even if only tangentially connected to Juan II's court, Rodríguez del Padrón was a hidalgo, known to have traveled to other kingdoms and would likely have had the means and abilities to witness and comprehend the harsh realities in Castile present by the end of Juan II's reign: "Castile lay impoverished, her government in ruins, her people divided, and her future prospects dim indeed" (O'Callaghan 566). At the same time, Rodríguez del Padrón may have witnessed, or at least been aware of his king's penchant for play and games.⁶ According to the account of Fernán Pérez de Guzmán, Juan II was more interested in games and leisure activities than actual governing (Macpherson 100). Basing his information on the accounts of Pérez de Guzmán, Ian Macpherson explains that Juan II was a king who "had little taste for the business of ruling, who delegated state affairs to his favorite Álvaro de Luna, and whose reputation depended almost exclusively on his love of the 'conportes e plaseres e gasajados'" (100). Macpherson goes on to state: "Juan II cared passionately for tournaments, jousting, the ring and the quintain, pasos de armas, juegos de cañas (mock tournaments fought with bulrushes), and celebrations and festivities of all kinds" (100). The descriptions of Juan II coupled with the grim picture of Castile offered by O'Callaghan appears to coincide with Huizinga's portrayal of late medieval nobility turning ever more often to play and recreation to deal with their harsh surroundings.

Viewing Rodríguez del Padrón as a product of a time and place that accepted conflict and play as simultaneous phenomena, the current chapter takes a closer look at his use of four playful or ludic elements in *Sla*, which he used to deliver a message about the serious and often deadly Game of Courtly Love. I label these four components the four ludic pillars of the text. The first

⁶ Padrón would also have been familiar with local festivities and celebrations evidenced by his mention of July 25th celebrations within the pages of *Sla*. Antonio Prieto contends that Padrón was referring to, "tres fiestas muy populares en Galicia: la de los mayos, la de San Juan Bautista y la de Santiago Apóstol" (104).

part of this chapter deals with the first three ludic pillars: allegory, poetry, and myth. I trace the playful origins and connections to each of these components in order to show how Rodríguez del Padrón uses ludic material in order to highlight the conflictive nature of Courtly Love. The second section of this chapter highlights the fourth ludic pillar, which is strategy. Drawing from a modified version of modern-day Game Theory which has been successfully applied to literature, I analyze the intercalated story entitled, *Estoria de dos amadores*, to demonstrate how Rodríguez del Padrón establishes a game-like atmosphere between his characters. I analyze characters' strategic decisions as though they were players in a game, demonstrating how only those that can strategize better than their opponents are capable of winning. Rodríguez del Padrón's abundant reliance on concepts strongly connected to play and games to showcase the harsh realities of Courtly Love leads me to call for the creation of a new ludic fiction category which would better reflect the deep-rooted connection to play found throughout the text.

A considerable amount of scholarly activity about this literary creation has centered on the question of whether or not it has arrived to us in its complete form.⁷ Javier Herrero summarizes the two sides of the debate well as he explains:

On the one hand, the book is declared to be a finished work, whose theme is the glorification of courtly love; on the other, the book is considered unfinished and its theme is seen to be the condemnation of courtly love. The problem of the completeness or incompleteness of the novel is important because it is directly linked to the essential one of the total meaning of the book. (751)

⁷ Cocozzella points out that, "past assessments of the *Siervo libre de amor* proceed, in the main, from the assumption that its unity of composition is quite strained, if not altogether lacking, and, hence, regard the work itself, a priori, as seriously flawed" (188).

As Herrero points out, what is truly at the heart of the debate about completeness is how we can best understand the meaning that Rodríguez del Padrón wanted to convey. As a counter to the ongoing debate about structural integrity, Herrero, as well as Coccozzella and others, have suggested that finding thematic unity will better explain Rodríguez del Padrón's true intentions rather than any definitive answer about the work's structural completeness. Focusing on the use of play and conflict allows for such a unified thematic approach to the text. While I would suggest that the presence of the play/conflict phenomenon, along with Rodríguez del Padrón's ultimate message about the dangers of Courtly Love indicates that the text is structurally complete, the benefit of recognizing the play/conflict foundations of the work is that it can help move the discussion beyond debates about the text's completeness or concerns over structural integrity. The play/conflict amalgamation is present in the text, regardless of whether or not one believes that the final sections of the text are whole or incomplete.

Rodríguez del Padrón's tendency toward the use of ludic or playful material can also be seen in the parodic nature of his poetry. Gregory Peter Andrachuk confirms Rodríguez del Padrón's use of parody as he states: "Padrón's skillful integration of theme and structure may be seen in the poem 'Sólo por ver a Macías' in which the poet parodies the death and resurrection of Christ" ("A Re-examination" 300). Citing his poem, *Los siete gozos de Amor*, which presumably parodies the more serious poems about the *Siete gozos de la Virgen*, Dorothy Severin refers to Rodríguez del Padrón as, "the precursor of the Spanish language tradition of amorous impiety" (*Religious* 21). Padrón's reliance on parody in his poetry demonstrates that he was certainly not immune from the tendency of the nobility to turn toward playful activity. If a spirit of playfulness can penetrate its way into Padrón's poetry in the form of parody, why can the same not be true for *Sla*?

In fact, Severin specifically describes a transfer of ludic material from poetry to prose by several fifteenth-century writers, including Rodríguez del Padrón, as she states, “in the Spanish sentimental romance, the religion of love is always basically ludic and humorous, a concept developed in *cancionero* poetry and then transposed into prose, often by the self-same writers (Juan Rodríguez del Padrón, Diego de San Pedro)” (*Religious* 13). For Severin, the ludic side of the Sentimental Romances manifests itself in the form of parody as she claims that Sentimental Novels, “frequently contain self-parodying elements which undercut the tragic interpretations of the lovers’ deaths” (“The Sentimental” 314). While Severin sees *Sla* as a more, “sober product (partially of a repentant maturity) than his parodic poem *Los siete gozos de Amor*”, she goes on to state that, “This landmark poem established several of the motifs that will be picked up in *Siervo* and later works, namely the comparison of the lover to Christ, the lover’s hell, and the tomb” (*Religious* 76-77).

In addition to Juan Rodríguez del Padrón, Severin also cites the works of Juan de Flores and Diego de San Pedro, whose works will be analyzed in subsequent chapters of this investigation, as having a ludic quality due to the parody contained within their pages. Although Severin does acknowledge that *Sla* is a bit more “sober” than other texts, her discussion of parody as a central characteristic of the *novelas sentimentales* does, in my opinion, open the door and allow for the possibility of further investigation into the ludic foundations of the genre. The current chapter, as well as my dissertation project as a whole, attempts to move beyond the notion that play is limited to parody or comedy, but can instead manifest itself in a variety of forms, particularly when issues of conflict and competition are present. At the moment Rodríguez del Padrón decided to showcase the dangerous and disastrous effects of Courtly Love, he did so by relying on themes and approaches strongly grounded in the play concept. The

following sections of the chapter explore the ludic underpinnings of *Sla*, showcasing how these play-inspired components of the text work in unison to deliver a message about the harsh and conflictive nature of Courtly Love. The ease with which Rodríguez del Padrón combines issues of play and conflict can be seen as a reflection of his fifteenth-century reality, which witnessed death, destruction, and elaborate games and festivities taking place side by side on a regular basis.

Rodríguez del Padrón's Ludic Choices

The first ludic pillar upon which Rodríguez del Padrón constructs his narrative is allegory. The current analysis traces the ludic nature of allegory, demonstrating how and why Rodríguez del Padrón constructs and maintains a game-like play-world to warn against the dangers and conflictive nature of Courtly Love. Speaking broadly, allegory allows Rodríguez del Padrón to tap into the reader's playful imagination and also permits him to present his message in a ludic and safe manner. Allegory is one of the most prominent features of *Sla*, as well as many other *novelas sentimentales*. Scholars such as Regula Rohland de Langbehn, Louise M. Haywood, and Oscar Martín have included the presence of allegory as a defining feature of Sentimental Romance, especially in the earlier Sentimental Novels such as *Sla*. Martín, for example, states:

In this sense, and taking allegory as matrix of sentimental fiction, the historical evolution of sentimental fiction is in itself a spatial evolution that takes as departing point love's

allegorical space to a widening in subsequent re-creations toward other spaces of love, where there is an increasing reduction and eventual disappearance of the allegorical space to materialize love's experience. ("Allegory" 134)

Javier Herrero also underscores Rodríguez del Padrón's use of allegory in *Sla* by stating: "The book, as should be expected in a work which is delicately balanced between the late Middle ages and the early Renaissance, has a very powerful allegorical content" (752).⁸ While it may be "expected" to see allegory given the historical time period within which the text was written, the fact remains that Rodríguez del Padrón consciously chose to include this literary device with strong connections to play in his work. Noting the connection between allegory and play, Huizinga rhetorically asks, "Are we justified in calling this innate habit of mind, this tendency to create an imaginary world of living beings (or perhaps: a world of animate ideas), a playing of the mind, a mental game?" (*Homo Ludens* 159).⁹ Writing about the connection between allegory and mental games, Peter Hutchinson states:

The Greek allēgoria, 'speaking otherwise', has provided modern literature with a relatively simple, yet occasionally abstruse form of game. Allegorical works challenge their readers to detect a secondary, partially hidden level of significance. This level may sometimes be deliberately emphasized by the author. (54)

⁸ In his study of Juan de Mena's *La coronación*, another work written in the first half of the fifteenth-century, Feliciano Delgado León explains that, during the time that Mena wrote his work there was a "mentalidad alegórica universal" (39). In addition to recognizing the influence of Dante, Delgado León also states, "Para la formación de la mentalidad alegórica medieval existieron unos autores fundamentales que la conformaron. Baste citar la *Consolación de la Filosofía*, de Boecio; la *Psychomachia*, de Prudencio; el *Anticlaudio*, de Alain de Lille, y *Las bodas de Mercurio* y la *Filosofía*, de Marciano Capella" (39).

⁹ Herrero, and others, see the allegory included in Padrón's text as fundamentally didactic in nature, even though there is an ongoing debate about the message which is ultimately conveyed to the reader. Herrero, for example, states, "the author is allegorically condemning courtly love because it imprisons the human heart, brings with it an anguish that compels man to commit suicide, and, consequently, drags man to eternal damnation" (753).

As stated by Hutchinson, the use of allegory is often “emphasized” by the author, and can be considered a type of game played by both author and reader alike, as the former creates challenges for the latter to overcome in order to find “significance” and “detect” meaning. In the case of Rodríguez del Padrón, that “meaning” includes opinions on the dangerous effects and fundamentally ludic nature of Courtly Love.

Perhaps due to the basic and straightforward nature of Rodríguez del Padrón’s allegories, combined with the somber outcome for the characters, play and games may not be the first thing to come to mind when analyzing *Sla*. And yet, Rodríguez del Padrón invests a considerable amount of work setting up his allegorical world at the beginning and end of his text, and the majority of his efforts find strong affinity with a person creating a playful and game-like experience. Like any person about to engage in play, Rodríguez del Padrón’s first step is to draw upon the power of imagination. While Louise Haywood asserts that the use of allegory in *Sla* is an opportunity for the lover to explore his consciousness, she also mentions in her analysis that “This reflexivity suggests the importance of the role of imagination and memory in these texts which self-consciously narrate past events. (“La escura” 423). The mention of “imagination” in Haywood’s analysis opens the door to understanding the true nature of allegory as a form of play; imagination based play.¹⁰

Imagination, a phenomenon strongly tied to play, is the key to successfully implementing and understanding allegory in the text. Writing on the interaction between play, creativity, and imagination, Lieberman states, “It is commonplace to talk about imaginative play in young children and about a creative person who is imaginative. This implies that, in naturalistic

¹⁰ Victoria Rivera-Cordero elaborates on the use of allegory to explore consciousness as she states, “Siguiendo los pasos de Dante, Rodríguez del Padrón explora el espacio de la conciencia del individuo por medio de imágenes que subrayan la confusión y desesperación de un caminante extraviado” (75).

observation, we consider imagination to be part of play and creativity” (2). Sutton-Smith develops the connection between play and imagination even further as he explains, “When there is well-developed imaginative play, there must always be some entry into nonliteral behavior, which leads to the introduction of acts or objects that are only for pretend purposes” (159). In a sense, allegory is for “pretend purposes”. A person pretends that one item or person is an acceptable temporary representation for another item or person. Imagination can be thought of as the gateway through which an individual is able to enter into a world of play. Through the use of imagination, Rodríguez del Padrón introduces his reader to a “nonliteral” world of personified emotions and symbolic terrain. Through imagination, Rodríguez del Padrón invites his reader to “play” with the allegorical figures and environment that he has created in order to teach them a lesson about Courtly Love.

The didactic tendencies associated with Rodríguez del Padrón’s allegories can also easily be explained through the concept of play. Understanding why Rodríguez del Padrón relies on play is just as critical as understanding how. Paraphrasing the work of early childhood psychologist Greta Fein, Sutton-Smith writes, “children give their play a structure, which is based on experiencing in a safe way the intense and even potentially disturbing emotional relationships of actuality or fantasy” (158). Structured play is for testing the waters in the real world. Lieberman would seem to concur with this conclusion about play as preparation for the real world, as she too writes that play’s, “most important function is one of working over experiences as a preparation for activities that must be mastered for the reality of living” (77). Exploring one’s feelings through allegory may be much safer than sharing them in a direct manner, especially with the outside real world. Due to its “nonliteral” nature, allegory engages

and stimulates the imagination with very little risk to the participant. Allegory, forged in play, is an effective and safe pedagogical tool.

Some brief specific examples should suffice to highlight the more nuanced inner-workings of Rodríguez del Padrón's literary game, helping us to understand more clearly how he establishes and maintains his ludic endeavor, and how the reader is enticed to play along. For instance, Rodríguez del Padrón's explicit up-front acknowledgement of his reliance on allegory makes its use all that much more playful, setting the tone for the rest of the work. As the subsequent analysis will show, this signaling of one's intentions, in the right circumstances, can be considered playful. Hutchinson states that allegory created in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance was "straight forward and often naïve" (54). There is no mistaking the allegory used by Rodríguez del Padrón. In his opening address to Gonçalo de Medina, juez de Mondoñedo, the narrator, who goes by the name Johan Rodríguez del Padrón, specifically mentions the use of allegory as he states:¹¹

Eficiones, digo, al poético fyn de aprouechar y venir a t  en placer con las fablas que quieren seguir lo que naturaleza no puede sofrir aprouechar con el seso aleg rico que trahe consigo la ruda letra, aunque parece del todo fallir; la qual sy rrequieres de sano entender, armas te dizen contra el amor. (68)¹²

Rodr guez del Padr n clearly explains the didactic nature and purpose of his allegory. Shortly thereafter, Rodr guez del Padr n even provides the meaning behind his allegory as he clarifies

¹¹ The fact that the narrator's name is also Juan Rodr guez del Padr n in and of itself can be considered in some sense ludic. Padr n is blurring the boundaries between reality and fiction. This, in some ways, is the very definition of play.

¹² One will notice that Padr n establishes a competitive theme from the beginning of the text as he provides the reader with "armas". Gregory Peter Andrachuk states that the text gives "armas contra el amor mundano, por medio de la historia personal del autor" (*Prosa y poes a* 61). The bellicose image of "armas" reminds the reader that love is a form of competition which will ultimately have winners and losers.

the symbolism behind the three paths and three trees which represent the various options that an individual has in relation to love:

El siguiente tratado es departido en tres partes principales, según tres diuersos tiempos que en sy contiene, figurados por tres caminos y tres árboles consagrados, que se refieren a tres partes del omne, es a saber: al corazón y al libre aluedrío y al entendimiento, e a tres varios pensamientos de aquellos. La primera parte prosigue el tiempo que bien amó y fue amado; figurado por el verde arrayhan...La segunda refiere el tiempo que bien amó y fue desamparado; figurado por el árbol de paraíso...La tercera, y final, trata el tiempo que no amó ni fue amado; figurado por la verde oliva. (65-66)

Rodríguez del Padrón's explanation about the use of allegory and his subsequent clarification of its meaning is signaling to the reader that he or she will be entering into an "as if" world of make-believe created by the author.¹³ Alerting the reader that he is operating in an imaginary, play like register, is in many ways similar to the way in which a child may assure others that he is simply "playing" as he enters into an imaginary world of make-believe. Referring specifically to children and make-believe, Holly Giffin asserts that:

One of the most significant aspects of the framing of make-believe play is the metacommunicated message 'this is play.' Understanding that behavior is symbolic enables others to respond appropriately 'as if.' Merely establishing the fact of play is not sufficient for collective make-believe, however. Specific transformations of specific

¹³ In "Representing the Social World in Symbolic Play: Reality and Fantasy" Bretherton has also noted the "as if" nature of play: "The term *make-believe* is used in several different ways. First it serves to distinguish the level of everyday reality where one actually eats, drinks, and sleeps from the fictive [w]here one merely simulates these behaviors. It is in this "as if" sense that I used make-believe in the previous section. In a somewhat different sense the label *make-believe* refers to transformations of reality into fictive worlds where a spoon can be a telephone, toddlers can be mother or father, animals speak, and people can fly or become invisible. In this section I talk about make-believe in this second "what-if" sense" (32-33).

objects, persons, time, space, action, and rules must be understood for an imagined event to be conjointly represented. (74)

In the same manner as a child may inform his or her observers about what is or is not play, Rodríguez del Padrón, by giving an explanation of his allegory, is clearly letting his readers know the proper way to interact with and interpret his text; through the help of imagination.¹⁴ Of course, the reader of the text must be given the information about the symbolism of the various trees and paths used by Rodríguez del Padrón in order to make sense of the allegories presented throughout the work. In their study of what they term children's "fantasy play", Nelson and Seidman elaborate on the need for players to have shared experiences or information to engage in play by stating:

the requirements for establishing a shared world within which play can proceed need to be examined more closely. Briefly, these requirements are that both participants have available a representation of some event drawn from experience, each similar enough to the other's that they can communicate about that world and maintain a coherent scenario within it. (45-46)

Therefore, if one applies Nelson and Seidman's theory on "fantasy play" to Rodríguez del Padrón's text, both author and reader alike must not only agree to enter the fictitious play world created by the author, but they must also have a shared base knowledge in order to maintain some sense of consistency throughout the reading. In part, Rodríguez del Padrón provides that common background knowledge by giving an explicit explanation of the meaning of his allegories. Furthermore, taking into account that the meaning of the allegories is all that

¹⁴ Gregory Bateson too has written on communication in play. Following his observation of two monkeys playing he states, "Now, this phenomenon, play, could only occur if the participant organisms were capable of some degree of metacommunication, i.e., of exchanging signals which would carry the message "this is play" (68).

Rodríguez del Padrón explicitly explains, he may be assuming that the readers of his text will have had a similar cultural experience as he has had if they are to be expected to understand the rest of the fictitious world which he is creating, filled with courtly love, kings, and courtiers. Given that he most likely wrote this in a courtly setting, it may be safe to assume that his intended readers were fellow courtiers.

Regardless of the reader's background, he or she must agree to play by the rules established by Rodríguez del Padrón and thus enter the world of fantasy created by the author. This is true even for modern-day readers who must learn and internalize the allegories before proceeding into the fantasy world created within the text. The use of fantasy and games in literature has been elaborated by R.E. Foust who describes certain authors as fantasists: ¹⁵

The fantasist, on the other hand, uses copious rhetorical devices-such as alliteration, synaesthesia and onomatopoeia-devices which alert the reader to the "make-believe" quality of the narrative content. The fantasist also uses neologism extensively and tends to capitalize common nouns (such as Space and Pain) in order to personify inanimate objects and abstractions. These devices imply a world of metaphor, a mental world of image and event in which each image is alive and couched in the desire to metamorphose into something else...The highly connotative style requires certain mental operations on the part of the reader (primarily a willingness to suspend his empirical understanding of natural law for the duration of the reading experience). The fantasist's style is self-

¹⁵ R.E. Foust sees the interaction between author and reader in certain works of fiction through a game theoretical perspective, explaining, "Game theory's emphasis on the formative rules or "grammar" of play, and its explanation of the nature of literary exchange as a competitive encounter between equal forces (reader and writer considered as performative roles rather than as historical personalities) returns a portion of creativity to the reader. It presupposes a reader competent to decode the often disguised, condensed and displaced messages that the writer has encoded as a variety of verbal stratagems in the "play sphere" of the text" (42).

reflexive in that it is highly artificial, calling the reader's attention repeatedly to the imaginary world. (43)

Rodríguez del Padrón is certainly open and honest about the playful nature of the text (in that one must use their imagination to interact with it) when he mentions how the “seso alegórico” ultimately provides “armas...contra el amor” (68). If one applies Foust's definition of a fantasist to *Sla*, one could see how Rodríguez del Padrón can be considered a “fantasist” in some sense, with his reliance on make-believe mental images.

In the recent quote by Foust, one will notice that a fantasist uses a style which is “calling the reader's attention to the imaginary world” (43). This candid interaction between author and reader underscores that play is often times, though not always, a quite conscious activity.

Hutchinson specifically addresses the self-conscious nature of literary play as he states, “Another characteristic of literary play is its self-conscious nature: in order to function as game, play must draw attention to itself” (14). Here one can see that Hutchinson distinguishes between play and game, and he later goes on to explain the difference between the two: “Games may involve sustained or intricate play, but they may also be seen as specific examples of play where some sort of rule can be seen in operation-such devices as allegory, parody, prefiguration- in which a clear method is adhered to. Play is less organized and less controlled” (14). In this case, if one applies Hutchinson's distinction between play and games to Rodríguez del Padrón's work, it is clear that Rodríguez del Padrón's use of allegory is not merely play, but an attempt to use playful elements to establish a game-like structure within his text, since allegory requires the reader to adhere to certain rules to ascertain meaning.

The use and interpretation of allegory can be seen as the initial aspect of a controlled literary game established by Rodríguez del Padrón. However, one does not normally organize and agree to play a game without actually playing it. Once the reader has accepted the “terms” of the game, and has decided to enter the allegorical world established by Rodríguez del Padrón, the reader is then presented with the first challenge in the game as he or she must now decide which one of the three “caminos” is the correct choice. The game would be quite limited if there were no challenges or obstacles to overcome. In reality, that is the entire purpose of the text. How does one choose the right path? In the Game of Love, much like a game of chance, an individual is presented with several options, without always knowing the correct choice, and without always knowing the best strategy for winning the game. Caillois refers to this type of game as, “*alea*”, which he describes as, “all games that are based on a decision independent of the player, an outcome over which he has no control, and in which winning is the result of fate rather than triumphing over an adversary” (17). In some sense, the narrative voice is attempting to eliminate this amorous game of chance, played in the “real world”, and even the odds by providing the reader with his personal experiences in matters of love. The reader can safely enter into the playful game like world established by both author and narrator to avoid making a mistake in the more serious and unpredictable Game of Love out in the real world.

Once inside the allegorical game composed of “caminos” and “árbores”, the reader is immediately introduced to characters created through allegorical personification. The narrator engages in conversation with the character Discreción, who states, “Devrías te avergonçar de no me querer seguir, e syn ser apremiado, asý te luego rendir por catyuo de quien hasta aquí eras tan grand enemigo” (70). With the appearance of a personified virtue, the reader must now recognize that there is a new element to the game of allegorical make-believe established by the author,

which until now has only consisted of an allegorical sylvan landscape. The narrator now interacts with the virtue of Discretion in an embodied form, and their encounter is a bit contentious from the start. This is an initial, albeit brief, example of how the author utilizes play to showcase conflict. Given that the author has already warned the reader about the allegorical nature of his text, that is to say the rules by which this literary game operates, it is not so difficult for the reader to accept an embodied character of Discretion scolding the narrator. Nevertheless, it shows once again, the need for the readers' continuing use of imagination in order to "play" along with the allegorical world established by the author as he or she must now try to understand the words of the concept/character Discreción. The lesson here is that Courtly Love has put the narrator into direct confrontation with Discretion.

Further along in the text, the narrator has another somewhat conflictive interaction with the allegorical character Entendimiento, who is important because he confirms the consistency of the rules established by Rodríguez del Padrón. One may recall in the previous quote by Nelson and Seidman that one of the "requirements" of play is the ability of players to maintain "a coherent scenario within it" (45-46). Entendimiento provides a level of consistency in Rodríguez del Padrón's imaginary world by specifically mentioning the previous allegory of the olive tree as he states, "no es mi voluntad de pasar, ni seguir tu dañada compañía; e solo más quiere prender la angosta vía, que demuestra la verde oliua, avnque muy áspera sea, que mal acompañado yr contygo a la perdiçión" (81). Here Entendimiento seems to understand and confirm the allegorical world set up by the narrator in the beginning of the text, preferring the narrow path marked by the olive tree than the company of the narrator. Once inside the game, the "rules" set forth by Rodríguez del Padrón for understanding his allegory appear to remain consistent. This fact is important since the reader will need to rely on the pre-established rules set forth by

Rodríguez del Padrón in order to play along and make sense of what he or she is reading, especially now that the allegory has turned to personified allegory. Entendimiento's knowledge of the olive tree helps to maintain the internal consistency of Padron's game. Though consistent with the world established by Rodríguez del Padrón, the appearance of Discreción and Entendimiento, requires the reader to manage both "topographical allegory" and "personification" described by Haywood as traits of the text ("La escura" 423). This certainly requires a bit of imagination and effort on the part of the reader. If the reader is unwilling or unable to play along, the text would not successfully transmit its overall message to the reader and instead would be a series of confusing statements about trees, paths, and virtues.

For those that are willing to play along until the end of the text, perhaps the most important personification is that of Synderesis who makes a brief appearance in the last lines of the text. Despite her short appearance, it is crucial that the reader understands this allegory in order to unlock the final message about finding peace set forth by the narrator. According to the Real Academia Española, the word "*sindéresis*" means, "Discreción, capacidad natural para juzgar rectamente" (*Diccionario*). Ultimately, the character Synderesis will represent the narrator's encounter with peace and understanding after abandoning all hopes for Courtly Love. According to Rivera-Cordero, "Si entendemos "*sindéresis*" como "discreción" en el sentido de buen juicio, entonces la llegada de este personaje alegórico supone la adquisición de una capacidad para obrar o elegir de manera acertada, lo cual se logra con una mente sana" (285). As with the other personified characters, Synderesis' appearance takes place in the imagination of the narrator, though in this case all conflict has ceased now that he has chosen the path which leads away from Courtly Love. In fact, directly before presenting Synderesis, the narrator mentions that he found himself deep within his own imagination as he states, "E asy errado por

las malezas, mudado en las más altas árboles de mi escura maginança, por devisar algún poblado, falléme ribera del grand mar, en vista de vna gran vrca de armada” (111). One last time the narrator speaks of his “maganança” or imagination, perhaps reminding the reader that he or she will soon have to interpret the appearance of Synderesis and how she fits in to the narrator’s thoughts, feelings, and overall message. All of these personified ideals, Discreción, Entendimiento, and Synderesis, can be seen as characters in the imagination of the narrator and together constitute a type of mental game of make-believe with which the reader must learn to interact in order to uncover their meaning. Most of the allegorical representations, except for Synderesis, represent how the pursuit of Courtly Love leads to conflict and confrontation. Interestingly, even Synderesis appears to arrive in a “vrca de armada” (111), or warship, perhaps indicating that even she must go to battle from time to time. If the reader is unable to play along and enter the world established by the narrator, all meaning will be lost or perhaps misinterpreted.

Although allegory is a central component of Rodríguez del Padrón’s text, it is not the only literary approach with strong connections to play that the author uses to highlight the conflictive nature of Courtly Love.¹⁶ Once inside the allegorical world created by Rodríguez del Padrón, the reader must also negotiate several examples of poetry, which is another element strongly grounded in play, and which I believe constitutes the second ludic pillar of the text.¹⁷ In fact, Haywood considers the inclusion of poems or songs to be a fundamental characteristic of

¹⁶ Addressing the combination of prose and poetry found in the work, Olga Tudorica Impey states that “Tanto la prosa como la poesía del *Siervo libre* versan sobre el mismo asunto: el amor desgraciado por una “grand señora” (“La poesía” 173). Tudorica Impey concludes that “todas las canciones del *Siervo libre* son partes integrantes, inseparables de la prosa” (“La poesía” 182).

¹⁷ Referring to poetry at the court of Juan II, Julian Weiss points out that “as Fernán Pérez de Guzmán’s *semblanza* of Juan II shows, it was sometimes thought that the monarch could take his fondness for poetry too far” (“Literary Theory” 217). By describing Juan II’s interest in poetry as at times going “too far” would seem to fit well with the previous description of his ludic courtly atmosphere.

the Sentimental Romance genre in general.¹⁸ Haywood asserts, “Lyric is present at all stages in the development of sentimental romance and in all three of the earliest sentimental romances” (“Reading” 132).¹⁹ Citing the work of Jane Whetnall, Haywood clarifies the term *canción*, which is a word used to describe the poetry found in many *novelas sentimentales*, by explaining, “canción was used to refer both to poems intended for reading or recitation and to lyrics for sung performance (“Reading” 137). As Huizinga reminds us, poetry and music have their origins in play. Huizinga contends that:

Furthermore, musical forms are determined by values which transcend logical ideas, which even transcend our ideas of the visible and the tangible. These musical values can only be understood in terms of the designations we use for them, specific names like rhythm, and harmony which are equally applicable to play or poetry. Indeed, rhythm and harmony are factors of all three—poetry, music, and play—in an absolutely equal sense.

(*Homo Ludens* 182)

In this passage by Huizinga, we can see the clear connections between music and poetry; mainly that they are both grounded in play.

In fact, Huizinga dedicates an entire chapter to the connections between poetry and play in his work *Homo Ludens*. According to Huizinga, “the function of the poet still remains fixed in the play-sphere where it was born. *Poiesis*, in fact, is a play-function. It proceeds within the play-

¹⁸ Addressing the combination of prose and poetry found in the work, Olga Tudorica Impey states: “Tanto la prosa como la poesía del *Siervo libre* versan sobre el mismo asunto: el amor desgraciado por una “grand señora” (“La poesía” 173). Tudorica Impey concludes: “todas las canciones del *Siervo libre* son partes integrantes, inseparables de la prosa” (“La poesía” 182).

¹⁹ Addressing the specific poetry found in *Sla*, Haywood states, “The main function of lyric in *Siervo* is formal. All seven lyrics function thematically (dealing with love service), narratively, or both” (“Lyric and Other” 192). Expressing a somewhat similar sentiment about the function of verse in *Sla*, Regula Rohland de Langbehn explains that, “En el *Siervo libre* de amor las poesías definen los diversos estados por que pasa el amante entre su propio rechazo del amor, anterior al tiempo narrado, y la aceptación de ser rechazado él por su dama” (“Argumentación” 577).

ground of the mind, in a world of its own which the mind creates for it” (*Homo Ludens* 141).

Huizinga goes on to state, “Poetry, in its original culture-making capacity, is born in and as play-sacred play, no doubt, but always, even in its sanctity, verging on gay abandon, mirth and jollity” (*Homo Ludens* 144). Huizinga sees poetry being influenced by a number of forms of play, “All poetry is born of play: the sacred play of worship, the festive play of courtship, the martial play of the contest, the disputatious play of braggadocio, mockery, and invective, the nimble play of wit and readiness” (151). As we will see shortly, many of the poems included in *Sla* can be categorized under the play which Huizinga refers to as; “martial play of contest”, “festive play of courtship”, and “sacred play of worship”.

Poetry, however, cannot only be seen as a form of play, but as a type of game as well.

Michel Beaujour states:

I posit that poetry is a *game*, or like a game. Game or play are not to be taken as opposed to the serious pursuits of life. Work also can be viewed as a game: a strategy which pits a player against some kind of opponent and/or obstacle according to some set of rules.

From this point of view, the situation of the poet is similar to that of the chess-player: he enjoys the same kind of freedom and the same kind of limitations on his freedom. (58)

Beaujour does not only assert that the poet is a player, but he also elaborates on the poet’s opponents by stating, “The poet plays against two opponents, which are, ultimately, the two faces of the same coin: language and the subconscious” (60). For Beaujour, the subconscious is, “an indispensable element in the game...If the subconscious prompting is necessary to start the game, it must also be tamed and channeled, as well as frequently coaxed” (60). According to Beaujour, the subconscious is the inspiration for the poet’s creation. In the case of the narrator,

his love for the “señora” has not only prompted his subconscious to create a play-world filled with allegorical paths and embodied virtues, but also to interact with them through poetry.

The other “opponent” mentioned by Beaujour is language. According to Beaujour, “Inspiration ‘comes’ to the poet as language, and the poem will be a linguistic object...he must play with, and also against the rules of his language...in order to subordinate them to the rules of poetry...the game consists in finding a way to complete the poem” (60-61). Referring specifically to the poems found in *Sla*, Jesús A. Ara asserts: “Aunque la redondilla más corriente durante el siglo xv constaba de versos octosílabos-nunca eneasílabos-y tetrasílabos, Juan Rodríguez usó una variante métrica al insertar versos de cinco sílabas (222).²⁰ Ara’s observation shows that Rodríguez del Padrón did follow certain rules of poetry, but at the same time experimented with other combinations to help him achieve his goals.²¹

As previously stated, Huizinga saw several forms of play in poetry: “the martial play of contest”, “the festive play of courtship”, and “the sacred play of worship” (*Homo Ludens* 151). A brief analysis of the poetry found in *Sla* will reveal that Rodríguez del Padrón used each of these three poetic play forms in his text. The very first poem recited by Discreción (which is simply an example of what the narrator has stated to Amor in the past) can be categorized as a “martial play of contest” or perhaps “invective play” between the narrator and “Amor”. Huizinga explains that, “Poetry as a social game of little or no aesthetic purport is to be found everywhere and in the greatest variety of forms. The agonistic element is seldom missing” (146). The competitive

²⁰ For additional discussion about the technical aspects of Padrón’s poems in *Sla* see Gregory Peter Andrachuk’s article, “A re-examination of the poetry of Juan Rodríguez del Padrón”.

²¹ Tudorica Impey also notes Padrón’s experimental approach by stating, “Juan Rodríguez no sigue a pies juntillos la tradición de la lírica trovadoresca en su obra, que sólo aparentemente está regida por la convención. Como otros tantos poetas castellanos, anteriores y posteriores, Juan Rodríguez goza en someter dicha convención a experimentos, goza en tantear su resistencia para introducir en los puntos débiles unas notas si no individuales, por lo menos autóctonas, castellanas” (“La poesía” 187).

relationship between the narrator and Amor, evidenced in verse, is first established in prose as Discreción reminds the narrator of how poorly he has treated Amor in the past: “qué merced esperas del contra ty ayraído amor, que así maltrataste por tu odiosa canción” (70). Discreción goes on to repeat the *canción* delivered by the narrator in the past in verse:

Sy sin error puedo dezir,
esta canción
leal servir a ty, amor,
es perdición. (70)

Clearly there is a conflict or struggle between the narrator and Amor which has existed for quite some time. In essence, the narrator is directly challenging the validity of Amor, and all those that would follow his path. By stating this, the narrator has positioned himself in an agonistic and antagonistic relationship with Amor, delineating winners and losers and clearly asserting that those who follow him are bound to lose. The *canción* continues and quickly takes on a more invective tone as the poem states:

Plega a dios de te traher
amor, a tan mal estado,
que padescas el cuydado
que me hazes padecer. (70)

This is a confrontational way for the narrator to address *Amor*. The narrator is no longer in a simple competition with Amor, but now wishes him personal harm as well. The narrator continues his agonistic assault on Amor, by offering the reader an alternative to the path of love:

Amigos
vuestro perder

por bien amar mi alegría,
 los que siguen otra vía
 biuen en todo placer. (70)

The narrator offers the path for those that wish to avoid perdition. In other words, the narrator is offering the reader the way to be a “winner” by avoiding Amor. Given the fact that Huizinga sees both poetry and competition as being grounded in play, and taking into account the fact that Rodríguez del Padrón has established a game like, playful reality from the very beginning of the text, and this particular example of Rodríguez del Padrón’s poetry only adds to the ludic nature of the text. After reciting this poem, Discreción urges the narrator to end the conflict with Amor, as he states, “No dubdo yo, sy tu no vienes en condiçión que hazes con él perpetua paz, sin más contender, que la furia de aquel no te sea merçed, y merçed dolor perdurable” (71). In other words, Discreción advises the narrator to end the battle and to seek peace. Discreción seems to know that a prolonged battle will do the narrator no good. The narrator quickly accepts Discreción’s advice and offers a poem, originating from his heart, which implies that the narrator wishes to cease the “martial play of contest” in which he and Amor find themselves. The poem begins, “Pas a pas, gentil señor” (71). The narrator’s heart urges him to make peace with love and end the conflict:

Por ende, gentil señor,
 sy vos plaze aver contienda,
 yd buscar quien vos defienda,
 que no so contra el amor. (72)

Referring to the poem/song recited by his heart, the narrator states: “De la qual, según ledo semblante de la muy generosa señora de mi, el amor se mostró muy contento; e quanto mas mis seruicios le continuaba, más contenta de mí se mostraua” (72). With this line, the narrator

indicates that the agonistic relationship between “amor” and him has ended, though their truce will not last long. A short battle, but a battle nonetheless, played out to its end through verse. This same line also allows the narrator to make a smooth transition from his own world of mental make-believe in which he addresses “love”, to the “real world” where love has apparently been pleased by his words and has allowed the narrator’s object of desire to notice him favorably.

Now that his “señora” has noticed him, the narrator enters into an interaction with her which can best be placed under Huizinga’s category of, “the festive play of courtship” (*Homo ludens* 151). Huizinga notes that poetry can take the form of, “a product of the age-old game of attraction and repulsion played by young men and girls in a spirit of badinage” (144). At first glance, the narrator seemingly leaves one play realm, that of martial contest, only to enter into another, this one a game of Courtly Love. Examining the relationship between Courtly Love, play, and poetry, Roger Boase contends: “Given the conventional stylized character of the form and content of medieval courtly lyric and the festive circumstances in which this type of verse was sung or recited, there is a strong case for analysing Courtly Love in terms of a theory of play. Love, play and poetry are clearly interrelated phenomena” (103). Referring specifically to poetry and play in Iberia, Ian Macpherson asserts that, “The play element-love is a game, poetry is a game-was there as a component from the outset” (97). Though no longer in the middle of Huizinga’s, “play of martial contest”, the narrator will find no peace, since even “the festive play of courtship” is forged in competition (Huizinga 151). The narrator enters the Game of Courtly Love, or the “festive play of courtship” (Huizinga 151) by sending his “señora” a poem which starts with the line:

Recebyd alegamente,

mi señora, por estrenas
la presente. (73)

The narrator wishes to show his devotion and to advance their courtship by offering his heart:

La presente cançión mía
vos embía
en vuestro logar d’España,
a vos y a vuestra compañía,
alegría;
e por más ser obediente,
mi coraçón en cadenas por presente. (73)

As in any competition one can win or lose, and at this point the narrator is hoping for a victory. In effect, the narrator of the text wishes to “defeat” the will of the “señora” and “win” her heart through poetry. Despite the underlying competitive nature of Courtly Love, the poem is light-hearted and good natured, as the narrator wishes “alegría” to his lady and her companions. Although brief, this poem can easily be classified under Huizinga’s category of the “festive play of courtship” (*Homo ludens* 151).

In addition to the poetry used to communicate between characters, Juan Rodríguez del Padrón also included poetry in *Sla* in the form of the “tragicos metros” found on the tombs of Ardanlyer and Lyessa in the short intercalated story entitled, *Estoria de dos amadores* (102). The tale of Ardanlyer and Lyessa will be analyzed in more detail in the following section of this chapter, but their death and memorial allows Rodríguez del Padrón to include the verses on their tomb which begin with the line, “Exemplo y perpetua membrança” (102). These particular verses can be seen as the “sacred play of worship” which Huizinga referenced as one influence on

poetry. Here Rodríguez del Padrón relies on poetry to establish a place of worship and remembrance for these two deceased lovers. In addition to being a form of “sacred poetry”, we also see here that Rodríguez del Padrón may have been playing with the readers’ expectations. In her discussion of *Sla*’s thematic borrowing from Dante, Brownlee asserts that Rodríguez del Padrón makes the reader believe that the tomb and its verses are intended to praise the two lovers, when in reality it is a pretext to insert Christian ideology.²² Brownlee explains that, “What Rodríguez del Padrón effects in this epitaph is a subversion of our “generic expectations.” That is, we are led to expect a final (pagan) apotheosis of the lovers-yet our attention is abruptly shifted from such a glorification of human love to a concern with the (Christian) Day of Judgment” (“The Generic” 634). If this “shift” is intentional, it could be seen as an attempt to manipulate or play with the expectations of the reader through versification.

Regardless of whether or not Rodríguez del Padrón was “playing” with the reader’s expectations, the “trágicos metros” are attached to the tomb, and thus help shift the reader’s attention to what I consider to be the third ludic pillar of the text; the element of myth. Rodríguez del Padrón smoothly transitions from discussing the “trágicos metros” inscribed on the tomb, to explaining the events which come to pass all around the place upon which they are written. As the analysis will show, the tomb of the two lovers evolves from a sacred site, to a place of competition, then yearly ritual and festivity, until finally turning into more of a myth to explain the origins of the city of Morgadán. Each of the activities used by Rodríguez del Padrón to create the myth: the sacred acts, the competitive challenges, and the rituals and festivities, has connections to play in its own right. In fact, myth itself is connected to play, and also poetry.

²² Brownlee attributes the connection between *Sla* and Dante to Gregory Andrachuk. According to Brownlee: “With regard to the *Siervo*’s literary antecedents, some critics see Boccaccio’s *Fiametta* as the obvious precursor, while others disagree entirely with this hypothesis. It is only recently, with the ground-breaking work of Gregory Andrachuk (1977), that the strategic importance of Dante’s *Commedia* for an interpretation of the *Siervo* has begun to be recognized” (“The Generic” 630).

Huizinga sees myth and poetry as being intimately linked and commonly connected through play, what he calls the “three fold connexion” (*Homo Ludens* 151). According to Huizinga:

In whatever form it comes down to us, myth is always poetry. Working with images and the aid of imagination, myth tells the story of things that were supposed to have happened in primitive times. It can be of the deepest and holiest significance. It may succeed in expressing relationships which could never be described in a rational way. (*Homo Ludens* 151)²³

In addition to play, myth also has strong connections to literature. Connecting myth and literature, Hutchinson explains, “Myth, when used consciously, directs the reader’s attention towards certain features which the writer wishes to stress, whether these be relationships, actions, attitudes or ideas” (74). On the surface, the myth surrounding Ardanlyer’s and Lyessa’s tomb helps to explain the origins of the city of Morgadán. In reality, Rodríguez del Padrón elaborates this myth to showcase the intense challenge and competition which lovers must go through to reach the inner chamber of the palace where the tombs of Ardanlyer and Lyessa are located. In other words, he is showing the challenge that exists for anyone wishing to match their devotion. In this sense, Rodríguez del Padrón establishes the entire myth based on love being seen as a competition or challenge, which, as previously mentioned, is an activity strongly grounded in play.

²³ In addition to Huizinga, Joseph Campbell has also written about the connection between play and myth. According to David L. Miller: “Campbell’s researches have led him to view myth as the basis of a people’s understanding. But the basis for the meaning-function of myth, Campbell argues, is play. The ‘logic’ of myth, like the ‘logic’ of play, is the ‘logic’ of ‘as if’” (20). As was previously mentioned with Rodríguez del Padrón’s use of allegory, myth too can display a playful “as if” quality.

Rodríguez del Padrón describes how the site of the two lovers' tomb "fue encantado" (103) and immediately became the site of competition for all lovers to prove their worth before eventually turning into the city of Morgadán (105). The narrator states:

Ninguno passava al primer aloje, donde era el sepulchro de Lamidoras, syn ser conquistador y leal amador; e no syn menos afán, al segundo albergue, donde era la tumba muy alta de la muy generosa Yrena. E convenía al aventurero ser fuerte y leal en el primer grado; e tocar al segundo por comparatyuo; e dende al terçero por superlativo; el qual otorgava el fyrme Padrón, guarda mayor de las dos sepulturas, donde eran sepultados los muy más leales. (103)

The enchanted palace establishes a series of challenges which need to be passed in order to prove one's strength and love. This is the quintessential game and competition, with precise rules and a clear winner and loser. The narrator explains how noble men and women from Africa, Asia, and Europe would make the journey to this palace, "en prueba de aquesta aventura" (103). The challenge appeared to be too great as all who tried received nothing but, "Sola tristeza, peligro y afán" (104). As the myth goes, the only individual to overcome the enchantment and reach the inner chambers of the palace, which held the tombs of the two deceased lovers, was none other than the famous lover and poet Macías.²⁴ According to the narrator:

Macías, gadisán del águila, naçido en las faldas de[e]ssa agra montaña, por su grand gentileza, lealtat, destreza y grand fortaleza, viniendo en conquista del primer aloje, dyó franco paso al segundo albergue. Después de los dos grandes peligros, contrastes,

²⁴ In his work *Poesía cancioneril*, Michael Gerli states that "Macías es uno de los más antiguos poetas de cancionero conocidos, representante de las corrientes líricas gallego-portuguesas del siglo XIV. Debió de florecer entre 1340-1370. La temática amorosa de sus versos, que tuvieron gran difusión a lo largo del siglo XV, sin duda contribuyó a que en torno a su figura surgiera posteriormente todo un cariz legendario de mártir del amor" (188).

reueses, pauores, affanes que el buen gadisán, gridando Bulcán, sufría por tocar al
Padrón, entrando el cárçel, çessó el encanto, y la secreta cámara fue conquistada. (105)

According to Antonio Prieto in the introduction to his edition of *Sla*, “La atracción por sentirse en la huella de Macías es casi obsesiva en Rodríguez del Padrón” (11). In addition, Andrachuck states: “In his cancionero poetry, Juan Rodríguez del Padrón has insisted on the similarities between himself and Macías, and in fact, his poetry betrays a deliberate attempt to emulate the work of the poet martyr (“The Function” 31).²⁵ In short, Rodríguez del Padrón depends upon the pre-established myth of Macías to create a new myth centered on his own literary creation.²⁶

The organized competition which takes place at the tomb of the two lovers is a central ludic component of Rodríguez del Padrón’s myth explaining the origins of the city of Morgadán. However, the events which directly precede and follow the description of competition are also strongly tied to the concept of play. Though two distinct forms of play, both the sacred initiation of the tomb as well as its use for future festivities shows the site of the tomb to be grounded in a sense of the ludic.

The fact that the tomb becomes a form of shrine indicates a spiritual component, and Huizinga sees firm connections between the spiritual and the ludic. Referring to Plato, Huizinga confirms that “He had no hesitation in comprising the *sacra* in the category of play” (37). Huizinga goes on to clarify that “The Platonic identification of play and holiness does not defile the latter by calling it play, rather it exalts the concept of play to the highest regions of the

²⁵ For Victoria Rivera-Cordero, Padrón sees himself as the “heredero” of Macías as she states: “la poesía (y el poeta como su representante) constituye la única fuerza que puede penetrar los secretos del amor. El autor se declara heredero del noble Ardanlier y de Macías (también hijo de la región)” (“Enfermedad” 280).

²⁶ Robert Folger notes that some critics have seen the inclusion of *Estoria de dos amadores* as a break with the tradition of love represented by Macías. Folger explains: “Unos críticos ven en la *Historia de dos amadores* un *exemplum* que induce al *Siervo* a romper con la tradición amorosa cuyo último eslabón es Macías” (“Memoria” 206).

spirit...In play we may move below the level of the serious, as the child does; but we can also move above it- in the realm of the beautiful and the sacred” (38). In her own discussion of the connection between sacred spaces and play, Diane Ackerman states: “A sacred place is a playground, the temporary home of one’s exaltation, where one travels to find rapture in what is essentially an open-air seminary of the mind” (*Deep play* 66). Victor Turner also reminds us that even in funerary rituals, play can be present:

In tribal and agrarian cultures, even relatively complex ones, the innovative potential of ritual liminality seems to have been circumscribed, even dormant, or pressed into the service of maintaining the existing social order. Even so, room for “play,” Huizinga’s ludic, abounds in many kinds of tribal rituals, even in funerary rituals. There is a play of *symbol*-vehicles, leading to the construction of bizarre masks and costumes from elements of mundane life now conjoined in fantastic ways. There is a play of meanings, involving the reversal of hierarchical orderings of values and social statuses. (*From Ritual* 85)

As we will see, Rodríguez del Padrón’s description of Yrena’s funerary procession and later devotion to the lovers’ tomb can be seen as a form of sacred play.

When Ardanlyer’s servant, Lamidoras, arrives at the site of the secret palace after the couple’s death, he finds that princess Yrena has ordered the construction of the tomb and she is there to greet him upon his arrival. Rodríguez del Padrón describes the scene as a very sacred moment:

he aqui Yrena, acompañada de dueñas y donzellas, vestidas de su oscura librea. E hecha la deuida salua, en rrecuentas de las aventuras, descendieron al nuevo templo de la deesa

Vesta, do reynava la Deesa de amores, contraria enemiga de aquella, llorando agramente, sospirando, viniendo en çerco de las dos sepulturas que la Infante mandara obrar de quatro virtuosas piedras, en que perseueran oy día sus muy gloriosos cuerpos. (101)

The image of this sad descent into the temple of Vesta, with Yrena's "donzellas" dressed in dark clothing takes on a very solemn and almost sacred tone. In a footnote in his edition of the text, Prieto explains that there existed a "hipérbole sacroprofana fundiendo a Vesta con la Virgen María" (101). If there did exist any connections between Vesta and the Virgin Mary, this would no doubt make the moment all that more solemn and sacred. Despite the somber tone, one will remember in Turner's previous quote that even the clothing or "costumes" in a funerary ritual can be considered "a play of *symbol-vehicles*" (*From Ritual* 85). Furthermore, in that same passage Turner mentions that at such ceremonies one can find, "a play of meanings, involving the reversal of hierarchical orderings of values and social statuses. (*From Ritual* 85). An abrupt change in hierarchies and social positions is precisely what happens when princess Yrena decides to dedicate the rest of her life to the care of the tomb. Almost as a priestess at a temple, Yrena stays there for the rest of her life, watching over the two deceased lovers, praying for them until her own death. Rodríguez del Padrón explains that Yrena, "muy apasionada por su fallecimiento, en membraça continua de aquellos, siguió después en tan áspera vida a los dos amadores, por los librar de las penas, que por continuación de los años, el affanado espíritu ovo dexas forçado la compañía del genero cuerpo" (103). The imagery created by Rodríguez del Padrón is both sacred and spiritual.

As previously stated, Ackerman sees spirituality as one type of "deep play". As will be shown throughout the current study, the concept of "deep play" can be used to describe several "intense" human activities, but one definition given by Ackerman is that "Deep play is the

ecstatic form of play” (12). She goes on to state that “Deep play always involves the sacred and the holy” (13). Later, Ackerman clarifies that ecstasy “also means to be gripped by passion” (15). As recently mentioned, Rodríguez del Padrón does describe Yrena as “muy apasionada” after the death of Ardanlier (103). Her passion started as amorous love for Ardanlier and transformed into an extreme passion for the well-being of both Ardanlier’s and Liessa’s souls and eternal memory. If one returns to Huizinga’s explanation of Plato’s ideas on play, he points out that one can “move above” seriousness and enter into “the realm of the beautiful and the sacred” (38). In some sense, this is what Yrena has done; she has used her passion to enter into a sacred realm of devotion. This entire scene can be thought of as an example of play manifesting itself in the sacred.

In contrast to the solemn and sacred manifestation of play which takes place with the tomb’s initial creation, the site eventually turns into a more light-hearted form of play as well. After being a sacred space for Yrena, and then passing through the aforementioned moments of organized competition for nobles everywhere, the site finally turns into a place of yearly ritual and celebration:

armavan sus tyendas en torno de la esquivia rroca, oy día llamada la Rocha, donde se encierran las dos rricas tumbas, y se abren por maravilla al primero de mayo, e a XXIII y XXV de junio y jullyo, a las grandes compañías de los amadores que vienen de todas naçiones a la grand perdonança que en los tales días les otorga el alto Cupido, en visitación y memoria de aquellos. E por semblante via fue continuado el sytio de aquellos caualleros, príncipes y gentiles omnes, floresteros mayores del seje, que fue poblado vn graçioso villaje, que vyno después a ser grand çibdat...oy día posee al antiguo nombre de Morgadán. (104-105)

The tomb has now become a place of annual pilgrimage for lovers everywhere. We should remember that before it became the site of this yearly ritual, the tomb was the site of intense organized competition, an activity strongly grounded in play. Richard Schechner sees the connection between play and ritual as he states: “A coherent theory of play would assert that play and ritual are complementary, ethologically based behaviors which in humans continue undiminished throughout life” (“Playing” 5). Victor Turner also sees a relationship between ritual and play. While Turner claims that these two phenomenon are two “different types of frames”, which he describes as different “behaviors” or “moods”, he does feel that both ritual and play can be found in celebrations as he asserts: “Celebrations contain both ritual and play frames” (*Celebration* 28).²⁷ Visiting the tomb each year is not only a ritual, but also a religious celebration as the footnote provided by Antonio Prieto explains that “jullyo” refers to “tres fiestas muy populares en Galicia: la de los mayos, la de San Juan Bautista y la de Santiago Apóstol” (104). Huizinga reminds us that “Gradually the significance of a sacred act permeates the playing. Ritual grafts itself upon it; but the primary thing is and remains play” (*Homo Ludens* 36). He goes on to state that, “there is no distinction whatever between marking out a space for a sacred purpose and marking it out for purposes of sheer play” (*Homo ludens* 39). What is of interest is that this original site of devotion, then competition, and finally ritual, is also the eventual location of the city of Morgadán. As we will see in the following section of this chapter, the secret palace which marks the eventual site of the lovers’ tomb is actually constructed by Ardanlyer in the middle of an intense, game-like competition with his father, King Creos. That

²⁷ Turner sees these two frames as almost two opposite sides of the same coin. He distinguishes ritual frames from play frames by stating that, “ritual frames are based on the premise that “within this border what we do and say and think and feel is governed by the premise ‘let us believe,’ that is, trust in the truth, reality, or goodness of supernatural, transhuman beings, persons or powers regarded as the first and final causes of phenomena.” Play frames, to the contrary, depend on the formula “let’s make believe” or “let’s pretend”” (*Celebration* 28). In contrast to this view of ritual and play being opposite phenomena, we saw that with the concept of “deep play”, some can see play even in the most sacred of events. Of course, everything that Padrón includes in this myth and in his text in general is operating within the play frame, of “let’s pretend”.

being the case, there is a certain cyclical nature to Rodríguez del Padrón's ludic writing. The intense competition between Creos and his son leads to the sacred activities of Yrena, which lead once again to competition, which in turn begins to take on a sacred meaning once again. Citing Huizinga's theory, Miller explains: "Having established a definition of play and having surveyed its manifold connotations, the author notes that the initial culture formation of great civilizations, like the Greek one, is often to be found in play-contests (*agōns*) which manifest themselves in sacred rituals, heroic feats, sports, etc. As these societies pass out of an early agonistic and heroic phase, civilization becomes complex" (19). In essence, Rodríguez del Padrón has proved this point by showing how Morgadán was established on sacred devotion, competition, and ritual, all elements tied to play.

Myth, poetry, and allegory are all key elements found throughout *Sla* and together constitute the first three ludic pillars of the text. Each of these components by themselves has strong connections to the concept of play. Taking into consideration the abundance and importance that all three have in Rodríguez del Padrón's portrayal of the conflict involved in Courtly Love, and it becomes difficult to ignore the ludic/conflict underpinnings of the text. However, there is a fourth ludic pillar which has already been alluded to throughout this chapter, and that is the concept of strategy. Although traces of competition can be found in each of the first three ludic pillars, the element of strategic competition is a critical component of the intercalated story known as *Estoria de dos amadores*, and therefore requires its own separate analysis in the following section.

Game Structures and Performance in *Estoria de dos amadores*

The previous section focused on ludic elements included by Rodríguez del Padrón in *Sla*. The conspicuous, overt components of the text such as allegory, poetry, and myth have all been shown to be forged in the spirit and tradition of play and games. However, if one delves even deeper into Rodríguez del Padrón's work, past the obvious ludic elements found on the surface, it will be seen how even the deep, fundamental interaction between characters can be seen as game-like due to the incessant need for strategic thinking against an opponent. The section of *Sla* entitled, *Estoria de dos amadores* is a good example of strategic, game-like interaction between characters, which I consider the fourth ludic pillar of the text, and it will be the focus of the present section.

Estoria de dos amadores is a short tale about Ardanlyer and Lyessa, who against the wishes of Ardanlyer's father, king Creos, leave the kingdom of Mondoya and marry. As will be seen shortly, this narrative contains several characters that interact with each other in strategic ways to achieve their objectives. I propose that their interactions can be better understood by analyzing them through the prism of a game. In fact, many theorists, in a variety of disciplines, have noted the connections between human interaction and games. As stated previously, Erving Goffman is one such theorist who sees the benefit of studying the game-like aspects of human behavior. Goffman asserts that:

Students of social activity are increasingly using traditional and experimental games as working models. Games seem to display in a simple way the structure of real-life situations. They cut us off from serious life by immersing us in a demonstration of its

possibilities. We return to the world as gamesmen, prepared to see what is structural about reality and ready to reduce life to its liveliest elements. (*Encounters* 34)

Referring to Goffman's game model for social interaction, Ducharme and Fine assert that, "Goffman's game framework consists of rules governing the formulation and execution of strategies" (100). In other words, strategic thinking is an important element in human interaction, particularly when that interaction can be seen as a game. In the recent quote by Goffman, he mentions the idea of a "return to the world" after certain types of game play, and the subsequent application of the lessons learned from that play back in the real world. One may recall that the narrator of *Sla* also "returns" to his own world after remembering the tale of Ardanlyer and Lyessa, and does, in fact, apply what he has learned by remembering the story:

Complida la fabla que pasado entre mí avía, con furia de amor endereçada a las cosas mudas, desperté como de vn graue sueño a grand priesa diziendo: «Buelta, buelta, mi esquyvo pensar, de la deçiente vía de perdiçión quel árbol pópulo, consagrado a Hércules, le demostrava al seguir de los tres caminos en el jardín de la ventura; e prende la muy agra senda donde era la verda olyva, consagrada a Minerua, quel entendimiento nos enseñava quando partió ayrado de mí.» (107)

If we extend Goffman's concept of learning lessons through games to *Sla*, it will be shown that the narrator does indeed learn a lesson after contemplating the game-like interaction between Ardanlyer and his father Creos in *Estoria de dos amadores*. While many scholars conclude that the narrator has learned a lesson about love, I would extend that conclusion and specify that the narrator has also learned a lesson on the excesses and dangers of courtly play in general. The lessons on love are undoubtedly woven throughout the game-like atmosphere found in *Estoria de*

dos amadores. Viewing Rodríguez del Padrón's short intercalated tale through the lens of a game does not exclude any lessons on the dangers of Courtly Love, but it does expand the message to include a more general warning about the constant need for strategic and competitive thinking when engaged in such amorous courtly behavior.

Before entering into the game-like nature of the intercalated story, it may be helpful to further define the concept of a game as it relates to human behavior. Tedeschi, Schlenker, and Bonoma, define a game as "a situation in which the outcomes of two or more persons in interaction are conjoint and the persons are not certain which outcome will occur" (2). Similar to this definition, Clark C. Abt proposes that "a game is an *activity* among two or more independent *decision-makers* seeking to achieve their *objectives* in some *limiting context*" (6). Each of these definitions highlights the connection between games and human interaction, with the latter focusing specifically on the decision-making process. In other words, there is an element of strategy to what takes place between two individuals in a game.

In an effort to better understand the decisions being made by the characters in Rodríguez del Padrón's text, one can turn to modern-day Game Theory. Martin Shubik defines Game Theory as "a method for the study of decision making in situations of conflict...It is addressed to problems involving conflict, cooperation, or both, at many levels...The stage may be set to reflect primarily political, psychological, sociological, economic, or other aspects of human affairs" (8). Enric Mallorquí-Ruscalleda has already applied Game Theory to *Celestina*, a Castilian literary text from the late fifteenth-century. In a footnote, Mallorquí-Ruscalleda details how this theoretical model could be a useful tool in the examination of medieval and early modern Hispanic Literature in general, asserting:

En el campo de la literatura medieval y de la modernidad temprana, la teoría de juegos nos proporciona las herramientas teóricas necesarias para abordar, por ejemplo, el estudio de los intercambios económicos y las negociaciones y estrategias que se llevan a cabo en el *Cantar de mio Cid*. Igualmente válidas serían las aproximaciones que desde este punto de vista nos permitiría acercarnos al estudio de las negociaciones del sujeto colonial o, por ejemplo, al análisis del papel de las emociones y/o de la racionalidad de las decisiones por diferentes personajes conducen a un final trágico, o bien las implicaciones éticas del juego y su relación con el nacimiento de la moderna subjetividad o en el estudio de los cuerpos de conocimiento y cómo estos se manejan. (“Economía” 597).

While Mallorquí-Ruscalleda relies on Game Theory primarily to discuss the economic exchanges present in *Celestina*, he does illustrate the utility of applying this theory more generally to medieval and Early Modern Iberian texts. Applying Game Theory to Rodríguez del Padrón’s text will not only help illustrate how *Estoria de dos amadores* can be seen as game-like at its very core, but also why the characters make the decisions that they do given the full range of possibilities available to them. Furthermore, a closer analysis of the discarded decisions, those that are never implemented, can also tell us more about the cultural rules and boundaries which exist within the narrative itself. This will ultimately help to better situate *Sla* within fifteenth-century Iberian culture.

The narrative begins by highlighting the rift which forms between Creos and his son:

el rey Creos muy odioso era a su hijo Ardanlier, con grand themor que del avía. E las fuerças del temor acrecentaua en los coraçones de aquellos las grandes furias del amor de tal son, quel gentil infante, ardiendo en fuego venéreo, que más no podía durar el desseo,

por secreto y fiel tratado que al batyr del ala del primer gallo, pregonero del día, fuesen ambos en punto adereçados al partir. (84)

Ardanlyer openly disregards his father's wishes and runs off with Lyessa. This situation can be described as the beginning of what Victor Turner calls a "social drama", which he defines as "units of aharmonic or disharmonic process, arising in conflict situations" ("Social" 106). Turner characterizes the first stage of "social drama" as a "breach" in which there occurs a breakdown of social relations and the "deliberate nonfulfillment of some crucial norm regulating the intercourse of the parties" ("Social" 107). Following this definition, there is a definite "breach" in the relationship between Ardanlyer and King Creos, as Ardanlyer does not follow the patriarchal "norm" of listening to his king and father.

The cause of this breach, and the eventual tragedy which leads to Ardanlyer's and Lyessa's death, is described by Rodríguez del Padrón as Ardanlyer's sexual desire or his "fuego venéreo". This has generally been seen by many scholars as proof that *Estoria de dos amadores* is, in fact, a condemnation of Courtly Love. After all, upon recalling this story the narrator is convinced to follow the path of wisdom marked by the olive tree and leave love behind. In some cases, however, sexual desire can also be seen as a form of play, and so I would argue that *Estoria de dos amadores* could also be viewed as a warning against excessive ludic activity. In his discussion of how play is achieved and experienced, Michael J. Apter states: "one other general characteristic, which is so important in understanding the nature of play...is the preference which the individual has in this frame of mind for intense, and particularly for high arousal, experiences-'high arousal' here meaning 'worked up' and emotionally charged" ("A Structural" 17). Apter later goes on to include a "naked body" as one form of stimulation and arousal (19). Kurt P. Frey elaborates even further on Apter's idea of sexual activity as play by

stating: “Describing someone’s sexual behavior as ‘play’, then, is not the equivalent of describing that person’s activity; rather, it is describing, in Michael Apter’s words, ‘a state of mind, a way of being, a special mental set toward the world and one’s actions in it’” (55). Given that Ardanlyer’s sexual desire is what caused the original crisis and conflict in Mondoya, and understanding sexual activity as a form of play, Ardanlyer’s actions can be classified as a “breach” inspired by play, or what I would call a “ludic breach”.

This ludic breach in courtly behavior is also the first major decision that we see in *Estoria de dos amadores*; a decision which will initiate a series of strategic, game-like, interactions between Ardanlyer and his father. Ardanlyer must decide how best to avoid his father’s will and wrath, while King Creos must figure out the best way to fix the breach in Mondoya and re-assert his power. Much like a game of chess, Ardanlyer and his father become locked in a strategic game where the winner will take all. In game theory, this type of game, with one winner and one loser is called a zero-sum game. According to Steven J. Brams, “Contrary to the popular notion of a game, choices in game theory are not assumed to be frivolous. Quite the contrary: players in games are assumed to think carefully about their choices and the possible choices of other players” (*Biblical Games* 6). As we will see, Ardanlyer and King Creos must have seriously considered their own options, as well as those of their opponent, before making any final “moves”.

In order to better understand the moves or choices available to Ardanlyer, one can turn to Brams’ modified Game Theory system for classifying decisions. Brams has simplified, and all but eliminated, the mathematical components of Game Theory to more easily fit with literary

analysis.²⁸ Brams' approach calls for a simplified ranking system of characters' strategies, ranging from what he assumes to be the characters' ideal outcome versus the worst possible outcome for any given action. He lists the outcomes for these strategies from "best", "next best", "next worst", and "worst", assigning each outcome with a value of 4, 3, 2, or 1 respectively (*Biblical* 17). Brams admits that the selection process about what is "best" or "worst" can be a bit arbitrary, but he also believes that if people do not agree with the options that he enumerates, individuals are free to offer alternative possibilities. He does not see this as a negative development, but rather an opportunity for further dialogue. In that same spirit, I too acknowledge that the strategies and preferred outcomes which I will enumerate are a "best guess" based on cultural factors and information provided by Rodríguez del Padrón throughout his narrative. Other combinations of strategies and preferences are certainly possible. In fact, other combinations of strategies and preferences, particularly hypothetical decisions which the characters never choose, can only further help us understand why they make the decisions that they do make. Brams' system allows for a concrete way to measure human interaction in literature without complex mathematical equations. This form of analysis does help one understand characters' actions and can easily be applied to Ardanlyer's first major decision as he confronts his father's intransigence.

In reality, one must start with Creos's decision to either allow or prohibit the union between Ardanlyer and Lyessa before moving on to Ardanlyer's decisions. While Creos has only two options, to allow or not allow the marriage between Ardanlyer and Lyessa, there is a list of

²⁸ Commenting on Brams' contribution to Game Theory, Herbert De Ley states: "Brams' most important innovation is his approach to the game-theory notions of payoffs and utilities. Like most narrative texts, the Bible furnishes little *quantitative* information about its personages' preferences...Brams resolves this problem by relying exclusively on ordinal utilities-that is, on simple rankings of preference"(34).

preferred outcomes associated with each of Creos's two strategies. This list that follows maps out the various permutations derived from Brams' theory as it can be applied to *Sla*.

1. Do not prohibit the union. Ardanlyer and Lyessa decide on their own not to marry. This would be his "best" or most preferred strategy and outcome. (Best option value 4)
2. Prohibit the union. Ardanlyer and Lyessa follow his wishes and do not marry. This would be his "next best" strategy and outcome. (Next best option value 3)
3. Do not prohibit the marriage. See Ardanlyer and Lyessa married. This would be his "next worst" strategy and outcome. (Next worst option value 2)
4. Prohibit the marriage. See Ardanlier and Lyessa married. This would be the "worst" possible strategy and outcome. (Worst option value 1)

Creos's best option would be to prohibit nothing and hope the two lovers having a falling out of some kind. This would involve no conflict with his son, while at the same time the situation would work out to his liking. The second or "next best" option would be to prohibit the marriage and the two would not marry. This may cause temporary conflict with his son, but his power would be respected, and his preferences as well. Option number three, allowing the marriage would create no conflict with his son, but in this scenario the two lovers will marry which would produce a situation which goes against his stated preferences. If this preference had already been made public, this could also damage his power and authority as he will be seen to have easily been "overruled". In his worst possible option, Creos prohibits the marriage, but Ardanlyer and Lyessa choose to marry anyway, thus challenging his power and authority. Clearly, Creos knows that his first strategy and preferred outcome of doing nothing and hoping for the best is not likely to work out. The two have already expressed a desire to marry. Creos's choice seems clear, go with option number two. Prohibit the marriage and assume, since he is a king, that his son and

Lyessa will listen to him. And yet, despite choosing his next best strategy and outcome, which is also the most logical decision Creos could make, he somehow winds up losing this round since Ardanlyer and Lyessa defy his wishes and marry. More about Creos's decision will be discussed shortly, but in order to understand how Creos could "lose" so badly (a value of 1 in his list of preferred outcomes), we must first look at the options available to his son Ardanlyer.

To understand Ardanlyer's reasoning, we can turn once again to the categories provided by Brams. Taking into account Ardanlyer's "fuego venéreo" (84), the combination of his strategies and preferred outcomes is elaborated in the following list.

1. Marry Lyessa with his father's approval. This would be his "best" option and outcome.
(Best option value 4)
2. Marry Lyessa without his father's approval. Ignore his father's prohibition. This would be his "next best" strategy and outcome. (Next best option value 3)
3. Not marry Lyessa. Follow his father's prohibition. This would be his "next worst" strategy and outcome. (Next worst option value 2)
4. Not marry Lyessa even if his father approved of the marriage. This would be his "worst" possible strategy and outcome. (Worst option value 1)

The best option would involve no conflict with his father, but would still allow Ardanlyer to satiate his "fuego venéreo" (84). The next best option still allows him to fulfill his desires, but creates an instant conflict with Creos. Option number three is most likely unacceptable due to his overwhelming desire to be with Lyessa. Finally, option number four would imply that a problem between the two lovers had occurred, which again would impede the desire of Ardanlyer.

This standoff between Ardanlyer and his father can be described as a situation which, in Bram's game theoretical vocabulary, is called a, "game of complete information" (*Biblical* 15). According to Brams, a game of complete information is "a game in which each player knows the other player's (or players') preferences" (15). All indications are that both Creos and Ardanlyer are aware of each other's preferences. Creos is in full agreement with Lyessa's mother Julia, who, according to the narrator "no osaua venir a cumplimiento de su voluntad" (84). Given that the narrator described Creos as being "por la semblante vía" as Julia (84), it is clear that he has made the decision to prohibit the marriage. Therefore, Creos has already made the first move at the opening of *Estoria de dos amadores*. By being described as "odioso", it can be assumed that he has let Ardanlyer know about his decision. This implies that Creos has foregone the best possible outcome in his list of preferences; that somehow the two lovers will lose interest in each other. He has also eliminated the possibility of his third preference; that of having the couple marry and remain with him in Mondoya. As stated previously, eliminating option number three makes even more sense if one assumes that his preferences were already made public. And so, relying on the strength of his own authority, Creos confidently gambles that his second or "next best" outcome of prohibiting the marriage and assuming that his son will obey him will be more likely than his "worst" option. In fact, at this point, Creos may not even be aware that he is in the middle of a game, because as a King, it is safe to assume that his son and Lyessa will listen to him. In a sense, he fails to realize that he is in a zero-sum, winner take all game with his son. What he fails to realize is that not only is he in a zero-sum game, but that it is a "game of complete information," and Ardanlyer has also been weighing his options, trying to stay one step ahead of his father.

Effectively, Ardanlyer is able to win this round against his father. Once Creos makes the decision to prohibit the marriage, Ardanlyer is forced to choose between two options from his original list of four. His best option was to marry Lyessa with Creos's approval. That is no longer possible. His new preferred strategy is his "next best" choice of marrying Lyessa and leaving Mondoya (a value of 3), or he can choose his "next worst" option of listening to his father and not marrying Lyessa (a value of 2 on the matrix). While it may seem a bit risky to the average person to ignore a king's wishes, Ardanlyer does act in a rational manner by choosing his "next best" strategy and outcome. This strategy of ignoring his father and marrying Lyessa will give him what he wants, a chance to satiate his "fuego venéreo" (84). Besides, he is Creos's son, and he may also have factored that in to his decision, hoping that eventually his father would have a change of heart.

This brief analysis of the options and decisions made by Creos and Ardanlyer in their first encounter in the text can tell us much about these characters. On the one hand, Creos is confident in his own power, so much so that he bases his final decision on the weight of his own authority. Furthermore, he would appear to have ignored the possibility that he could become involved in a game-like situation with his son. At the same time, Ardanlyer appears less interested in the power structure of Mondoya and more interested in his own personal situation and desires. The "social drama" (Turner, "Social" 106) playing out between Ardanlyer and his father is ultimately a struggle to assert personal power and personal identity; both concepts which connect to Sutton Smith's previously mentioned rhetorics of play. Referring to the rhetoric of play as power, Sutton-Smith explains, "The rhetoric of play as power is about the use of play as the representation of conflict and as a way to fortify the status of those who control the play or are its heroes. This rhetoric is as ancient as warfare and patriarchy" (10). My analysis relies on

the rhetoric of play as power, using concepts of play and game to better understand the power relations in Mondoya. In the same way that play is connected to power, it has strong ties to the rhetoric of identity as well. Sutton Smith asserts: “It is difficult to distinguish the rhetoric of power from the rhetoric of identity. The purpose of most conflicts, contests, and expressions of power is to prove the superiority of one’s own identity, community, and traditions” (91). Both power and identity lay at the center of the “social drama” which unfolds between Creos and his son Ardanlyer. Ultimately, Creos asserts his identity through the use of his power. However, Ardanlyer is not interested in power, and, at least at first, not so interested in identity either. The only thing that drives him is his passion, which we saw had connections to play. There are no indications at the beginning of the text that Ardanlyer wished to usurp his father’s power or establish his own separate identity. One assumes that if Creos had allowed the marriage, Ardanlyer would be loyally serving his father. However, given that Ardanlyer has chosen his passion over power, he is left with almost nothing, and in need of establishing his own identity and power throughout the courts of Europe.

The narrator affirms Ardanlyer’s extensive travel by succinctly stating: “Ardanlyer, conoçido era en las cortes de los cristianos y paganos príncipes por el más valiente y glorioso cauallero que a la sazón biuía” (85). In effect, Ardanlyer is flaunting his new found independence in the face of Creos, and quickly widening the “breach” between him and his father to create a “crisis”. Turner explains that after a breach:

...a phase of mounting *crisis* supervenes, during which, unless the breach can be sealed off quickly within a limited area of social interaction, there is a tendency for the breach to widen and extend until it becomes coextensive with some dominant cleavage in the widest set of relevant social relations to which the conflicting or antagonistic parties

belong. It is now fashionable to speak of this sort of thing as the ‘escalation’ of crisis.
 (“Social Dramas” 107)

Ardanlyer decides to widen the gap and “escalate” the crisis with Creos. To understand why he arrives at that decision, we can once again rely on Game Theory. To better understand Ardanlyer’s decision to visit the courts of Europe, one must analyze Ardanlyer’s choices and preferences given his current situation. He must know that he has already angered Creos by disobeying his wishes and leaving Mondoya, and he must now make a decision based on the facts.

In reality, as in the father and son’s first encounter, Ardanlyer will first have to assess Creos’s strategies and preferences before making any decisions. Creos is really confronted with two options; accept that his son has left and allow him to make a life for himself or track down his son and attempt to impose his will upon him. His authority has been questioned and disobeyed by his own son. This cannot be a tenable situation for a powerful king, and it can be assumed that maintaining his power status and legitimacy is of utmost importance to him. Relying on Brams’ method of listing preferred strategies and outcomes, Creos’s own preferences are elaborated in the following manner:

1. Track down Ardanlyer and Lyessa and terminate their union. Hope for no resistance.
 (Best option value 4)
2. Track down Ardanlyer and Lyessa and terminate their union. Use force if they resist.
 (Next best option value 3)
3. Allow Ardanlyer and Lyessa to remain outside of Mondoya and not interfere. Never allow them to return. (Next worst option value 2)

4. Allow Ardanlyer and Lyessa to remain outside of Mondoya and not interfere. Allow them both to return home. (Worst option value 1)

Creos's best outcome would be if he could somehow go out and find Ardanlyer and Lyessa and end their union either with or without force. This would not only reverse the matrimony which he opposed from the beginning, but it would have the added benefit of showing everyone, both in and outside of Mondoya, that his authority and power are still intact. His next worst outcome would be to simply let Ardanlyer and Lyessa live happily ever after outside of Mondoya. This would be a perpetual reminder to everyone that he was unable to impose his will as king, nor was he able to ever remedy the situation. His final or worst outcome would be to allow them to live their life in peace and even return home eventually. In some sense, Ardnalyer would "win" by default in this last option. He would get to be with Lyessa and be king of Mondoya someday. Given these options, it is clear that Creos's "best" option, and "second best" option, is to find Ardanlyer and try to destroy his connection to Lyessa. It would be the only way to publicly and fully restore his own authority as king, which appears to be what motivates all of Creos's actions. We will see later on in the text that that is precisely what he does. However, in the meantime, these are simply *possible* options that Ardanlyer (and the reader) must consider at this point in the narrative.

Once again, Ardanlyer should know the possible scenarios running through Creos's mind. He should have known Creos fairly well, and may have known that maintaining power and authority was of utmost importance to his father. If he didn't know this on a personal level, he should certainly have known, as a prince of Mondoya, that a King cannot allow others to make him look weak and unable to control his own family. Assuming that Ardanlyer knew the importance of power and authority to his father, or to any king for that matter, he too would be

strategizing and determining the best course of action after such a bold move against Creos. Ardanlyer must decide if he should prepare or not prepare to deal with his father's eventual reprisal. Knowing his father's "best" option is to destroy his union with Lyessa, protecting himself and Lyessa from the wrath of his father would be a logical primary concern for Ardanlyer. Given what the reader knows about Creos, and what Ardanlyer presumably knows about his father, it is possible to map out Ardanlyer's choices and preferred outcomes in the following way:

1. Do nothing and hope for the best. Hope that Creos will have a change of heart. (Best option value 4)
2. Prepare a defense against Creos. Stay away from Mondoya and try to avoid contact with his father. (Next best option value 3)
3. Prepare a defense against Creos. Knowing that Creos will attack, Ardanlyer could decide to deal with his father directly to eliminate the threat through force. (Next worst option value 3)
4. Do nothing and wait for Creos's punishment. (Worst option value 1)

After considering Creos's options, and knowing that he will most likely attack, Ardanlyer would quickly be forced to abandon option number 1. Without an entire army, option number 3 must be discarded promptly as well, at least for now. He rejects the idea of entering into battle with his father, not only because he has no standing army at this point in the narrative, but he may also have entertained the possibility that his father would remain in Mondoya and not seek revenge, as unlikely as that may seem. That scenario would, after all, be Ardanlyer's preferred outcome. Also, we will see later on that once he does gain support of other kings through his own feats in battle, he makes no move to assemble an army or prepare militarily for his father's attack.

Instead, Ardanlyer will eventually choose total isolation at the secret palace, and later even resort to suicide, rather than face his father in a direct confrontation. Given his list of options, and those of his father, Ardanlyer chooses his next best option, option number two, which has a value of 3. He has chosen rationally and wisely to stay away from Mondoya and strengthen his own defensive position in preparation for Creos's eventual attack. Knowing that his father will most likely track him down, he has chosen to defend himself and his union with Lyessa by gaining and surrounding himself with allies throughout Europe. This is, as previously stated, purely a defensive move, as he knows that he will be safe without having to enter into battle with his father directly.

Although Ardanlyer does choose his next best option given the situation, his disobedience is effectively placing him in what Victor Turner would call a "liminal situation" by escalating the crisis. According to Turner: "In liminality, profane social relations may be discontinued, former rights and obligations are suspended, the social order may seem to have been turned upside down" ("Liminal" 59). Certainly, Ardanlyer's world has been turned upside down by both of his major decisions thus far, and yet, in both cases, he is acting rationally according to his own desires as well as through a careful consideration of what Creos may or may not do. Turner goes on to state that in this moment of liminality "past is momentarily negated, suspended, or abrogated, and the future has not yet begun. There is an instant of pure potentiality when everything trembles in the balance" (*Liminal* 75). And so, the decision having been made to strengthen his own position against his father, while still having done nothing to accomplish this, Ardanlyer is temporarily in a liminal space. Liminality, it turns out, also has connections to play.

At the moment of Ardanlyer's decision, he is in a liminal space, with a variety of possible outcomes. Turner explains that "Liminality is a complex series of episodes in sacred space-time, and may also include subversive and ludic events" ("Liminal" 59).²⁹ The mention of "ludic events" taking place during liminality is of great interest to the current study given that Ardanlyer decides to strengthen his position against Creos by entering into a series of tournaments and contests to prove his worth: "E asý en la peligrosa demanda como en batallas, justas, torneos, fechos y obras de gentileza, sólo Ardanlier poseya la gloria" (85). Ardanlyer relies heavily on ludic activities created to practice for war such as jousts and tournaments, as well as outright battle, to establish his own credentials and allies. In other words, Ardanlyer depends on play to strengthen his position and implement his strategy of building a strong defense against any possible attack from his father. Ardanlyer accomplishes this by demonstrating his masculine prowess. In *Jousting in Medieval and Renaissance Iberia*, Noel Fallows makes the connection between jousting and demonstrations of masculinity: "From both a physical and a symbolic point of view jousts offered tangible evidence of a man's prowess, of the meaningful role that he played in the masculine active life" (8). Just as an abundance of play in the form of carnal desire has put him into this agonistic relationship with his father, his own control over ludic activities also helps solidify his masculinity, which helps him gain allies in order to protect his union with Lyessa.

Ardanlyer does gain allies while in this state of liminality. In his first moments outside the structure of Mondoya, Ardanlyer interacts with others in an unstructured manner, serving no one king in particular: "Infynitos rreyes, duques, condes desheredados, dueñas, viudas, donzellas

²⁹ Turner asserts that "Liminality is peculiarly conducive to play" (*From Ritual* 85). Elsewhere, Turner explains: "it is the analysis of culture into factors and their free or 'ludic' recombination in any and every possible pattern, however weird, that is of the essence of liminality" ("Liminal" 60-61).

forçadas, cobraron por su fortaleza los reynos, prinçipados y tierras de que beuían en destierro, e reçebían continua fuerça” (85). All of these actions allow a growing number of companions to join his cause as the narrator explains how “Magníficos señores, y todos los gentiles hombres lo acompañauan y hazían estrañas caresas” (85). Ardanlyer is attracting men to his side, and as already stated he does this all through the strength of his sword and the demonstration of his masculinity. Though in a state of liminality due to his break with Creos, Ardanlyer is entering into a state of what Turner calls “*communitas*”, which is experiencing society as “an unstructured or rudimentarily structured and relatively undifferentiated *comitatus*, community, or even communion of equal individuals” (“Social” 113-114). Furthermore, Turner reminds us that, “*communitas* has something of a ‘flow’ quality” (“Liminal” 89) and explains that “A person ‘in flow’ finds himself ‘in control of his actions and of the environment.’ He may not know this at the time of ‘flow,’ but reflecting on it he may realize that his skills were matched to the demands made on him by ritual, art or sport. This helps him to ‘build a positive self-concept’” (“Liminal” 88). Indeed, Ardanlyer appears to be in control of every situation in which he finds himself after leaving Mondoya, and slowly but surely, his actions and activities fashion a “positive self-concept”. Through ludic activities, he is building an identity and power structure independent of what he once knew in Mondoya.

While the text provides very little evidence of what Ardanlyer actually did in all of the “torneos”, “justas” and “batallas” (85), we do know that he engages in these activities after angering his father, therefore it may be safe to assume that these activities are all deliberate attempts to gain favor throughout the courts of Europe in preparation for Creos’s eventual retribution. Given the deliberate and public nature of his actions, what he is doing is in some sense a public performance. Seeing human interaction as a form of performance, Goffman

asserts: “When an individual plays a part he implicitly requests his observers to take seriously the impression that is fostered before them” (“Performances” 61). “Fostering” the right “impression” is precisely what Ardanlyer must do if he is to succeed in fulfilling his previously mentioned “next best choice” of preparing for Creos’s eventual retribution. Ardanlyer needs to draw men to his side through the strength of his sword and he needs his actions to be noticed through a successful performance. Fallows elaborates on the importance of performance at jousts by stating: “In the case of jousts, individual performance was paramount and every action and manoeuvre was closely scrutinised with a view to awarding points to each jouster” (7). The concept of performance also has strong ties to play. Laura Kendrick reminds us that the term *ludus*, which can be translated as both “play” and “game” in English, has strong connections to the concept of performance and drama (49). Furthermore, Henry Bial explains that “all performances, even rituals, contain some element of play” (135). Given that Ardanlyer is in an elaborate and deadly competition with his father, it is interesting to note that he uses performance, an activity grounded in play, to implement his strategy of preparing for Creos’s revenge.

After all his work to gain allies, Ardanlyer abruptly abandons all of those “reyes” and “príncipes” who could have and would have protected him and Lyessa against Creos. Rodríguez del Padrón writes: “E después del común passaje en las quatro partes del mundo, y grandes passados peligros, que en loor de aquella que amaua más que a sí, con grand afan adaua a la ventura, fue llegado a las parte de Yria, rryberas del mar Océano” (87). Ardanlyer makes the unwise move of giving up the playing and games and decides to settle down and order the construction of, “vn secreto palacio, rrico y fuerte, bien obrado” (88). This is precisely where

Ardanlyer's logic begins to fail him. Ardanlyer will soon learn that once a game with a king has begun, deciding that you no longer want to play along is usually not an option.

It seems that all of Ardanlyer's actions were based entirely on what he assumed his father would do. Of course, Ardanlyer knows that he and his father's wishes are completely opposed, and he could safely assume that his father would choose his own best option of hunting him down. Hiding in the secret palace in some sense is an attempt to ignore the ludic, game-like reality in which he finds himself. Although it takes him seven years, Creos does eventually get the opportunity to make his move and continue the game. Rodríguez del Padrón explains: "E cumpliendo los siete años que byuía en aquel solo desierto, dados a la vida solitaria, su padre, rey Croes, rrey de Mondoya, desterrado de vn solo hijo que tanto amava, no tardó embiar en su alçança por estrangeras partidas. El muy lastymado Rey no pudo durar que no fuese en la busca" (88). Once Creos discovers the location of Ardanlyer and Lyessa's secret palace, Creos does not waste time in completing his move or his previously mentioned "best" choice. His goal is to destroy the union between Ardanlyer and Lyessa and reassert his own power and authority. It is for this reason that within moments of finding the pregnant Lyessa, "tendió la aguda espada, y siguió vna falssa punta que le atrauesó las entrañas, atrauesando por medio de la criatura" (90). Creos does not only terminate their union, but the product of that union as well in the form of the "criatura" still within the womb of Lyessa. Through this act, he has regained some of the power that he had lost with Ardanlyer's departure, but in the process he has erased all possibility of bringing Ardanlyer back with him to Mondoya. He also believes that he has forced Ardanlyer back into the game. All that is left for him to do is to wait for Ardanlyer's next move. He not only waits for it, but he informs Ardanlyer's servant Lamidoras where Ardanlyer can find him: "Dy, traydor, no menos dygno de las penas graves, al mí desconoçido hijo, tu criado, Ardanlier,

que pues falleció aquella por la qual trocado me avía, que no tarde de me seguir; e que lo yo entiendo esperar a la muy antiga çibdat de Venera, dos jornadas de aquí” (90). Fresh off of his successful move of eliminating Lyessa, Creos is anxious for an encounter with Ardanlyer.

Ardanlyer soon discovers that the King has resumed the game when he returns from hunting to find the dead body of Lyessa: “En medio del grand palacio vyó estar tendyda la falleçida Lyessa, traspasada con cuchyllo agudo, fuera del razonable sentido” (90). As if to highlight the fact that he seems to have forgotten that he is in the middle of a contest with Creos, Ardanlyer first accuses Lamidoras, his servant, of the crime: “No hallo en ty escusa salua, ni buena rrazón que te pueda saluar” (91). Although seven years have passed, it is noteworthy that Ardanlyer does not immediately think that Lyessa’s death is attributable to Creos. In fact, he only figures this out when Lamidoras specifically tells him what has happened: “el furioso rey Croes, cruel más que las fieras animalias brutas, que no han sentido de piedat...estendió la real espada que no has por conoçr, dentro ynoçente cuerpo de la syn ventura Lyessa” (92-93). It’s particularly telling that Ardanlyer needed to be told who killed Lyessa given that all of his previous actions appeared to be based almost entirely on the assumption that Creos would indeed attempt to terminate the union between him and Lyessa. As previously stated, Ardanlyer unilaterally decided to abandon the game with his father and lower his guard, with the result being that it cost him what he held most dear. At this point, whether he likes it or not, Ardanlyer is, if only temporarily, back in the deadly game which exists between him and Creos. Ardanlyer must make a new move through a new round of decision making. He has very few “preferred” outcomes at this point, given that what drove this character from the beginning was his desire to be with Lyessa. Ardnalyer is now driven by his love for Lyessa and his desire for revenge against Creos. He needs to decide whether or not he should join Lyessa in death, as well as whether or

not he should take any further action against Creos. All he knows about Creos at this point is that he is now waiting for him in the nearby city of Venera. He really has to make two choices here. On the one hand he must choose whether or not to commit suicide, while on the other hand decide whether or not to seek revenge against Creos. Taking these facts into consideration, his preferred strategies and outcomes can be examined by once again applying the Brams method:

1. Take revenge on Creos and then kill himself to prove his love and be united with Lyessa forever in the after-life. (Best option value 4)
2. Take no revenge. Kill himself in order to prove his love and be with Lyessa forever. (Next best option value 3)
3. Take his revenge on Creos and not kill himself. (Next worst option value 2)
4. Take no revenge against Creos, and do nothing to harm himself. (Worst option value 1)

This table of preferred strategies and outcomes reveals a shift in Ardanyler's actions. One will notice that in this decision there is no longer a consideration of what Creos may or may not do. In effect, Ardanyler has decided to exit this deadly game that he is playing with his father once and for all. He knows that his next move will be his last. Since the game is changing and will soon come to a close, Ardanyler must adapt to the new circumstances of his situation. His strategy will also need to change since he no longer needs to worry about what the other player will do. Given his love for Lyessa and his anger at Creos, the last option of doing nothing seems most unlikely. He could choose his next worst option, number 3, which would be simple revenge against Creos, but he still would be apart from Lyessa. The next best option would be to commit suicide, thus joining Lyessa and not worry about Creos at all. Of course, if he is going to kill himself, he must realize that option number one would be best. He could be with Lyessa and have revenge against Creos at the same time. In fact, Ardanyler once again thinks "rationally"

(within the parameters of his own desires) and chooses the best option available to him. He decides to seek revenge against Creos, thus bringing the game to a conclusion, and also be with Lyessa eternally. Interestingly, this may be the first decision that he has made without considering the possible reactions of Creos. Ardanlyer's willingness to die alongside Lyessa has finally given him a way to bring the situation to a close, thus ending the game on his own terms. Though final in its nature, Ardanlyer's actions will guarantee him a solid "win" against his father.

Ardanlyer decides to implement his dual-sided plan by writing a pair of letters and asking Lamidoras to deliver them personally after his death. The first letter is sent to the princess Yrena. The narrator explains: "rogándole por los bienes de la criança, después de su muerte passasse en la dulce Françia, e haziendo la salua con la deuda profierta de aquel a la fyja del Rey, con la secreta llave presentase la epístola que Ardanlier escriuió a la ynfante Yrena" (93). Ardanlyer writes to Yrena, expressing his love for Lyessa as well as his one-time interest in Yrena. In a sense, Ardanlyer is depositing and storing the memory of his love and devotion for Lyessa, in writing. In this way his love will live on in the letter and will be shared and remembered by Yrena. In reality, Yrena ends up going one step further than just "remembering" their love by immortalizing the two lovers with the construction of their tombs at the secret palace. Through his correspondence with Yrena, Ardanlyer has set into motion the creation of a memorial which will forever unite him and Lyessa.

The second part of Ardanlyer's plan is to build anger and ill will towards Creos. He has no intention of killing the king himself, especially since he must fulfill his first desire of being with Lyessa. Instead, he will rely on the friends and allies that he gained in his travels. Ardanlyer specifically asks Lamidoras to first publicly address the princess. He knows that this will be an

opportunity for a public retelling of his story. This will not only help prove his love for Lyessa when they find out that he has voluntarily joined her in death, but it will also begin to foster negative feelings for King Creos. Referring to Lamidoras, Rodríguez del Padrón writes:

...entra a la noble çibdat de París, do el Rey era a la sazón en las grandes alegrías que[e]l primero de Mayo se suelen fazer. E como el afanado viandante, çercando el aloje, continuase el viaje por la media plaça, poblada a la hora de grandes señores, duques, condes, caballeros, gentiles omnes, visto por la semblante manera el no desconoçido ayo del famosos Ardanlier, tan desseado, esperado aquel día, maravillados, çercándolo de todas partes, e en punto que vinieron en sabiduría de su padeçida muerte de los dos amadores, trocado el arreo, çessaron del juego; e toda la corte fue luego contristada. (96-97)

Symbolically, perhaps, Lamidoras interrupts the festivities and brings an end to the “juego”. He does this, in effect, with a public performance of his grief and sadness. Ardanlyer once again relies on a performance to implement his game plan, even if it is the performance of his servant. Lamidoras’s actions not only bring an end to the “juego” in the plaza, but also mark the beginning of the end of the larger game which has existed for more than seven years between Ardanlyer and King Creos. Furthermore, Ardanlyer was apparently expected at this celebration. This would imply that Ardanlyer knew that there would be a large gathering of people when Lamidoras arrived, thus solidifying his strategy to move against his father.

Shortly after delivering the public message and the secret letter, Lamidoras complies with the second part of Ardanlyer’s orders. Ardnalyer also asks Lamidoras to tell the story to the emperor in Hungary. According to the narrator, Lamidoras fulfills this request: “Por la semblante

vía le mandó passar con otra breve de creencia rogadora, en boz de aquel muy alto rey de Vngría, señor del Imperio, allende del triste caso” (95). Arndanlyer has cast a wide net, telling his story in France and Hungary in hopes that one of these powerful kings may avenge his and Lyessa’s deaths.

With both letters sent, Ardanlyer completes his final move by throwing himself on the sword which killed Lyessa:

bolvió contra sy en derecho del corazón la sutil y muy delgada espada, la punta que sallía de la otra parte del refriado cuerpo; e diciendo aquestas palabras en esquivo clamor:-
«¡Reçibe de oy más, Lyessa, el tu buen amigo Ardanlier a la desseada compañía!» E lançóse por la media espada, e dio con grand gemido el aquexado espíritu. (95)

After Lamidoras publicly delivers the message of the two lovers’ deaths at the court in Hungary, the emperor reacts decisively:

Derribó las tres coronas imperiales con el poderoso çetro, y rrasgó sus vestiduras; e al contrastado fyn del combite alçó la boz dolorosa en rrecuenta de sus fechos, dignos de loor nombrando los grandes peligros, tristezas, affanes, contrastes, rreueses, que en muchas batallas por él rreçibiera. E después de comendadas las ynoçentes ánimas de aquéllos, maldizía la causa porque él no podía vengar el amigo, syn quedar su capital enemigo. E luego, en presencia de aquellos señores, que no menos eran sentidos, puesto el estrado de luto, mostrança de la grand tristeza, hizo teñir delante sus armas el águila negra, segúnd que es oy día, que antes dorada ardía en llamas, primera devisa del Emperador. E a grand priesa mandó escreuir al muy odioso rrey Croes la presente epístola de rrequesta, pregonera de la enemistat. (98)

One would assume that this is the reaction that Ardanlyer was planning on. The emperor almost immediately mobilizes his forces with the intent of conquering King Creos. In the letter, the emperor states that Creos “feneçerá a nuestras muy poderosas manos” (99). In effect, Ardanlyer has “won” the game and resolved the conflict, since soon his father will be defeated and Ardanlyer will be forever united with Lyessa. Curiously, the only way to win the game was for Ardanlyer to leave it completely by strategically sacrificing himself, and allowing others to act on his behalf.

Leaving the game brings the reader full circle, as this is the message that the narrator has been trying to advocate all along. If we remember the three paths from the original allegory at the beginning of the text, the narrator writes: “La terçera, y final, trata el tiempo que no amó ni fue amado; figurado por la verde oliua” (66). As previously mentioned, directly after *Estoria de dos amadores*, the narrator wakes up, implying that the story of Ardnalyer and Lyessa was a dream, and he states: “Buelta, buelta, mi esquyvo pensar, de la deçiente vía de perdiçión quell árbol pópulo, consagrado a Hércules, le demostrava al seguir de los tres caminos en el jardín de la ventura; e prende la muy agra senda donde era la verde olyva, consagrada a Minerua, quel entendimiento nos enseñava quando partió ayrado de mí” (107). The narrator is near the olive tree, implying that he will now take the path which leads away from the Game of Love and towards knowledge too. Shortly afterwards, the narrator has his encounter with Synderesis, which can be interpreted as a symbol of knowing the best decisions to take. In other words, both Ardanlyer and the narrator realize that the only way to win is to move in a different direction and take a new road.

Some scholars such as Eukene Lacarra Lanz have seen this “retreat” or “exit” from the world as an autobiographical religious expression. Lacarra Lanz suggests that “Rodríguez utiliza

la ficción autobiográfica como vehículo para transmitir que la mejor vía de salvación es abandonar el mundo y acogerse al servicio de Dios que él ha elegido para sí mismo. Su obra es una especie de confesión agustiniana, no tanto penitencial como ejemplar” (“Siervo” 166-167). I agree with Lacarra’s overall conclusion with respect to what Rodríguez del Padrón accomplishes with this text. Lacarra also states two of Rodríguez del Padrón’s goals for writing *Sla*:

Me parece evidente que uno de los objetivos de Rodríguez del Padrón fue escribir una *reprobatio amoris*. Sin embargo, su verdadero final es más ambicioso, puesto que no se limita a reprobear el amor sino que nos muestra un modelo de conducta a seguir, que es el camino arduo y costoso del desamor al mundo y del amor a Dios. (165)

Without a doubt, Rodríguez del Padrón does provide a model to follow as the narrator decides to choose the path of the olive tree symbolizing knowledge. However, the *reprobatio amoris* does require a bit more scrutiny. Lacarra states that “La conclusión del narrador es que los personajes del ejemplo han actuado movidos por los apetitos concupiscentes y no por la razón y que por tanto son un ejemplo falso del que hay que huir” (166). I fully agree that the *narrator* has arrived at the conclusion that the characters in *Estoria de dos amadores* have acted irrationally.

However, taking into account the present study’s detailed analysis of their decisions, the characters’ actions may deserve a second consideration by the *readers* of the text. The actions should be considered less “irrational” and more “ludic”. In this sense, what the narrator may have provided is more of a “*reprobatio ludi*” than a “*reprobatio amoris*”.

Estoria de dos amadores can really be seen as a tale about the dangers of excessive play. The current study has shown that Ardanlyer’s “fuego venéreo” was the initial cause of the social “breach” in Mondoya. As previously stated, his sexual desire and arousal is grounded in concepts

of play, not irrationality. Ardanlyer's desire, grounded in play, created more complex and destructive play in the form of a deadly game. However, what should have been more disturbing to the narrator is that the characters, for the most part, actually acted quite rationally both outside and inside the game, demonstrating that ultimately they themselves lack control over the rules of the game, or even when it starts. Mostly every decision that the characters make in *Estoria de dos amadores* is based on rational, strategic decision making, taking into account other characters' preferences and self-interests. As stated previously, Ardanlyer's biggest mistake was letting his guard down and forgetting that he was in a competition when he retreated to the secret palace. The narrator's final decision to abandon the world and dedicate himself to holy endeavors can also be attributed to the fact that he no longer wishes to be involved in a courtly world where competition and play are a constant requirement for any participant even when that participant does not want to play along. The danger that *Estoria de dos amadores* shows is not so much the irrational behavior of the characters consumed by love, but rather the constant need for rational, exhausting competition for anyone that decides to engage in Courtly Love, or perhaps even worse, for anyone that happens to express any desire other than what the king deems appropriate. In reality, the actions of Ardanlyer are not all that irrational. He, a prince, decides that he is in love with a noble woman and wishes to marry her. This hardly seems to be an irrational act of uncontrolled desire on his part, though as previously stated, arousal could be considered ludic. What the story really highlights is that Creos, quite arbitrarily, decides not to allow his son to marry Lyessa. The only explanation given is that Lyessa's mother, Julia, was also against the idea. There is not even a hint that Creos attempted to intervene and convince Julia that the two should be united. So yes, leaving the world of Courtly Love and intrigue behind is certainly the conclusion that the narrator reaches, but the reader may also take away the

idea that the lives of courtiers in general appear to be complicated and dangerous as one must constantly be playing the game correctly or risk losing everything. In this sense there are two messages to be gleaned from *Estoria de dos amadores*: one that religious love is safer than carnal desire; the other that court life and reality is dangerous, complex, and highly competitive, not just in love, but in all things; surviving at court requires an individual to constantly play a game, and know how to play it well in order to survive.

The current chapter has analyzed *Sla* through a ludic lens. We have seen that Rodríguez del Padrón has utilized many elements based in play to create his work and underscore tension and conflict in a Courtly Love scenario. I have called these play-inspired approaches the four ludic pillars of the text. Allegory, poetry, myth, and strategy are prevalent throughout the work and all have their foundations in play. Furthermore, we have seen that at almost every level of the text, these ludic elements have helped shaped agonistic, competitive interaction between characters. This constant competition manifested itself not only in allegory, poetry, and myth, but particularly in the strategic interactions between characters in the short intercalated tale entitled *Estoria de dos amadores*. Game Theory has allowed us to see the intricacies and complex factors that go into each decision made in a courtly setting. Similarly, a consideration of the characters' performances has allowed us to understand how courtiers implemented much of their strategies.

Sla has traditionally been considered an early example of the Sentimental novel. It is true that emotions run high in this text. Psychological, emotional, and amorous elements do make up an important part of Sentimental novels, as well as this text. However, this chapter has shown that there is much more to Rodríguez del Padrón's work if we are willing to accept the importance of play in late medieval society. If we analyze the text through theories and concepts

based on play and games, this will help us to situate it within the social context of the late middle ages which, as Huizinga stated, “required that late medieval society transform the life of love into a beautiful play with noble rules” (*The Autumn* 128). The chapters which follow will attempt to do just that, to see both the Sentimental novel and the *libros de caballería* as part of this atmosphere of play so prevalent in the late Middle Ages. Ultimately, as Bohman-Kalaja has called for with postmodern texts (2007), a category of play may be needed to properly contextualize the *novela sentimental* and *libros de caballería* in the atmosphere in which they were produced. Perhaps *ficción lúdica* may ultimately be a more proper description of what was being produced in late medieval Iberia.

CHAPTER TWO: GRADISSA'S CHALLENGE: PLAY AND GAMES IN JUAN DE FLORES' *GRIMALTE Y GRADISSA*

The previous chapter presented the ludic elements which Juan Rodríguez del Padrón utilized to underscore the conflictive nature of Courtly Love. The analysis called for a reconsideration of the influence of play on Rodríguez del Padrón's work, in part, due to the fact that it was created during the reign of Juan II, a king who favored festive and game-like activities at court. The current chapter continues the investigation into the ludic underpinnings of conflict and competition found in fifteenth-century Romance novels by exploring the concepts of play and games found throughout Juan de Flores' *GyG*, a work written during the reign of Isabel de Castilla.³⁰ The first section of the chapter examines the way in which play and conflict meld together in several key episodes of *GyG* to create two simultaneous yet distinct reactions to the same events connected to Courtly Love: a playful, pleasurable reaction for the reader and an agonistic, difficult one for the characters.³¹ I present Michael Apter's adapted version of Reversal Theory, which deals with the various ways that an individual can interpret the same event depending on their view of the circumstances. I draw from this theoretical model to

³⁰ Both printed and manuscript witnesses of the text survive. Joseph Gwara explains this in his article entitled, "Observations on the Text of *Grimalte y Gradisa*": "when Barbara Matulka published her comparative study of *Grisel* and *Grimalte*, the only known Castilian version of *Grimalte* was preserved in an unsigned incunable (ca. 1495) attributed to the Lérida press of Enrique Botel. By the time Pamela Waley published her edition of the romance forty years later (Waley 1971), no other witnesses of *Grimalte* had been discovered. In 1976, however, two new manuscripts of the work came to light: Biblioteca Colombina (Seville), MS 5-3-20 (ff. 90r-101v), and Biblioteca Nacional (Madrid), MS 22018" (246).

³¹ The current investigation will rely upon Pamela Waley's 1971 edition of the text for in-text citations.

highlight the experiences of both readers and characters in *GyG* and to show that each of these two groups was, in fact, experiencing two very different forms of play simultaneously. The second section of the chapter highlights the affinity between many components of the text and various game categories. The analysis relies upon Roger Caillois' categorization of games to show that several areas of Flores' text have strong game-like characteristics. Flores' abundant use of themes and scenarios strongly tied to the ludic to showcase the consequences of Courtly Love leads me to include *GyG* into the aforementioned ludic fiction category, which I believe more accurately characterizes these fifteenth-century Romances that have play and conflict at their core.

By relying on Boccaccio's *Elegia di Madonna Fiammetta*, Flores constructs a narrative which not only continues the fictitious world of Boccaccio's tale, but also manages to incorporate the love story between his own characters named Grimalte and Gradissa.³² After reading that Pánfilo has abandoned Fiometa, Gradissa seizes the opportunity to rid herself of her eager suitor Grimalte by sending him on the difficult mission of reuniting the two Italian lovers. Though it proves to be arduous, Grimalte accepts this challenge and does eventually manage to arrange a meeting between Fiometa and Pánfilo. When the latter explains that the entire interaction with Fiometa was, in essence, a temporary lapse in judgment on his part, Fiometa passes away, grief-stricken by the revelation. Upon hearing this turn of events, Gradissa informs Grimalte that she will accept nothing less than Pánfilo's death if Grimalte ever wishes to be her lover. The rest of the story details Grimalte's nearly lifelong search for Pánfilo, who we later learn has taken a vow of silence, fled to Asia, and turned into a wild man living in the forest.

³² Summarizing Boccaccio's *Elegia di Madonna Fiammetta*, Ellan B. Otero states: "The plot is the narrator's struggle to accept her abandonment, and her refusal to do so. Lady Fiammetta-a married, aristocratic woman's pseudonym- relates her tale of how she had been loved and abandoned, beginning with the event in which her heart was captured by a young man 16 months earlier, up to the present moment. The structure consists of monologues and dialogues set within a framework of explanatory and, at times, foreshadowing, comments" (88).

Upon finding Pánfilo in these conditions, Grimalte feels a sense of pity and decides to give up his mission and join Pánfilo in his ascetic lifestyle, where the two suffer through harsh climates and other-worldly visions of Fiometa. The story ends with Grimalte informing Gradissa of his failure and stating that anyone that would follow in his footsteps will face the same fate.

While much of the narrative is constructed in prose, the printed witness and the Madrid manuscript also contain several verse insertions attributed to Alonso de Córdoba, which Louise M. Haywood confirms by stating: “ML have forty-two lyrics and other verse insertions which are ascribed to Alonso de Córdoba, possibly making this version a collaborative one” (“Reading” 130).³³ Haywood goes on to call this combination of prose and verse a “mixed-form narrative” (“Reading” 135). While the verse insertions are attributable to Córdoba, the rest of the plot and storyline are believed to be the work of Flores, an individual with strong ties to the court of Isabel de Castilla.³⁴

Elaborating on what is known about Flores, Joseph Gwara writes: “Research since 1987 has shown that Flores belonged to the court of Garci Álvarez de Toledo, the first Duke of Alba, and that he was appointed royal chronicler to Isabella the Catholic in 1476; apparently he was also named rector of the University of Salamanca in 1478, but never assumed office” (“Observations” 245). Gwara’s assertion establishes a clear connection between Flores and the court of the Catholic Monarch. Gwara also identifies Juan de Flores as the probable author of *The Crónica incompleta de los reyes católicos* (“The Identity”). This *crónica* would appear to

³³ The “ML” reference in Haywood’s quote refers to one of the two extant manuscripts of *GyG*, as well as a fifteenth-century printed version. Haywood explains that *GyG* is “extant in two manuscripts (Seville, Biblioteca Colombina, MS 5/3/20, fols 90^r-101^r; Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, MS 22018; hereafter, *S* and *M*, respectively) and one early printed edition (Lérida: Enrique Botel, c. 1495; hereafter *L*)” (“Reading” 130).

³⁴ In a footnote to her article “Reading Song in Sentimental Romance”, Haywood states: “Alonso de Córdoba has been identified as bachelor and later chair of music at the Universidad de Salamanca in the late 1470’s and in 1480” (130).

describe, in broad terms, the ludic nature of Isabel's court, as Gwara states: "the author consistently refers to grand receptions, elaborate battle scenes, feasts and other noble pastimes" ("The Identity" 120). If Flores is in fact the author of *Crónica incompleta de los reyes católicos* it shows that he certainly took notice of the play and games found at Isabel's court. As chronicler, Flores would also presumably be aware of a broad array of conflicts and wars in which Isabel was a key player. In other words, Flores would have been privy to both the conflictive and ludic sides of life at Isabel's Court. Having knowledge about wars, political conflicts, and other points of contention throughout the kingdom, combined with his knowledge of the leisure activities enjoyed at court, and Flores may have been very well positioned to observe how these seemingly disparate areas of life can merge and mix together. I propose that this mixing of play and conflict also made its way into *GyG*.

The ludic atmosphere found at the court of Isabel de Castilla has also been noticed by others as well. Writing about the role of irony in another of Juan de Flores's works, *Grisel y Mirabella*, John T. Cull reminds us of Isabel's interest in entertainment when he asserts that "Recent criticism has tended to dispel the myth that Isabel was a pious and humourless woman with no interest in popular literature or other forms of entertainment" ("Irony" 417). One particular form of entertainment found at Isabel's court is what Ana Menéndez Collera defines as "poemas con una intención lúdica" (425). Referring to the nobles at Isabel's court who were intended to hear this type of poem, Menéndez Collera explains: "el público para quien fue ingeniado el juego participaba frecuentemente en este tipo de actividades lúdicas" (426). Menéndez Collera bolsters her claim that the Isabelline court had a predilection for "ludic activities" by citing Alonso de Palencia's *Crónica de Enrique IV*, which describes the atmosphere at court: "Pasábanse los días en la distracción de los juegos, y la nobleza acudía a

muy varias atenciones, pues la juventud había hallado recientes estímulos al deleite en el séquito de la Reina” (Collera 426). Palencia’s account establishes clear connections between Isabel’s court and a ludic environment.

Other scholars have also examined the ludic nature of poetry written during Isabel’s reign. Ian Macpherson observes that the play found at Isabel’s court included elaborately staged tournaments with jousting and games, as well as after dinner literary reunions (101), and he specifically links this ludic atmosphere with the creation of love poetry:

The play element-love is a game, poetry is a game-was there as a component from the outset, and became one of its prominent features during the reign of the Catholic Monarchs... Whatever one says about the nature of Courtly Love, the element of play was an important ingredient from the earliest times. (97)

Macpherson further develops the idea that nobles at court are players in a game when he asserts that “The court of play is the closed confine of the royal and noble courts of the time, the players are predominantly upwardly mobile younger members of the nobility” (99). While the recently described courtly games appeared to have a festive tone, Macpherson also reminds us that the “players” at court did not take the concept of play lightly, especially when dealing with Courtly Love. Macpherson asserts that “The play element in Courtly love... is taken very seriously by a high proportion of the players” (99). The serious, yet game-like nature of Courtly Love is also reinforced by Julian Weiss who explains that “courtly lovers were indeed playing a game, but it was a game that constructed and institutionalized a particular set of values based on class and, particularly gender” (“Álvaro de Luna” 242). As Macpherson and Menéndez Collera have shown, the ludic reality found at court could ultimately manifest itself in the form of poetry.

The first chapter of this dissertation has shown that fifteenth-century writers dedicated themselves to writing both poetry and Sentimental fiction. E. Michael Gerli suggests that “The authors of the sentimental romances all fancied themselves to be courtier-poets” (“On Marina” 248). If the element of play was present in love poetry produced during Isabel’s reign, and many of the authors of Sentimental romances considered themselves to be courtier-poets as Gerli contends, then it should not be difficult to accept the possibility that Sentimental novels may also be grounded in play.

In reference to the works of Juan de Flores, Weissberger proposes that there is a Bakhtinian carnivalization at work, stating that “The comic portrayal of Arnalte and Grimalte are not in my view random events but rather evidence of the carnivalization of the sentimental genre, a process which may reflect and reinforce a subversive resistance to the male authority that modern scholars have assumed is upheld in these texts” (“Role Reversal” 200). As shown in this quote, Weissberger believes that the inverted gender roles present in a text like *GyG* would have been both comical and subversive.³⁵ Lourdes Albuixech also sees the “world upside down” theme in another of Flores’ works, claiming that “*Triunfo de amor*, compuesta según Antonio Gargano entre el 13 de septiembre de 1475 y el 21 de mayo de 1476, sería la primera de las obras de un autor que cada día se descubre como más prolífico. En ella encontramos uno de los ejemplos literarios más perfectos del *topos* medieval bautizado por Ernst Robert Curtius como «mundo al revés» (“Utopía” 182). Referring to fifteenth-century female readers, Weissberger states that “they would have laughed at the buffoonery of heroes like Arnalte and Grimalte and

³⁵ Weissberger also attributes Pamela Waley with detecting comical undertones to the depiction of the character Grimalte (“Role Reversal” 197). In her edition of *GyG*, Pamela Waley states that “Flores gives Grimalte attitudes and tasks and journeys similar to those of a chivalresque hero, but he is a sad failure, shown rather mockingly” (xxii). Lourdes Albuixech also gives credit to Pamela Waley for detecting the humor in *GyG* and she too sees humor as a component of Sentimental fiction, asserting: “El humor en obras como Arnalte y Lucenda, de Diego de San Pedro, o la anónima Triste deleytación, también ha sido puesto de relieve, y fácilmente podría distinguirse este ingrediente en otras obras que pertenecen al género” (“Utopía” 180).

applauded the distinct advantage their ineptitude grants the heroines in the courtly relationship” (“Role Reversal” 199). Through comical subversion, Weissberger appears to have opened the door to interpreting the Sentimental genre through a ludic lens. Regula Rohland de Langbehn confirms this by asserting, “En cuanto a la novela sentimental, Weissberger logra perforar un estrato de malentendidos que hacía de ella un género solemne y serio con ocasionales deslices grotescos, haciendo valer sus dimensiones lúdicas como fundamento de la interpretación” (“Un mundo” 125). Langbehn specifically recognizes the possibility that the *novela sentimental* contains “dimensiones lúdicas” (“Un mundo” 125).

In addition to “comical subversions”, other scholars such as Dorothy Sherman Severin explored the possibility of ludic intentions in several *novelas sentimentales* in the form of parody of genre.³⁶ Severin concludes that “a revised definition of sentimental novel might be that they are about courtly love affairs, and frequently contain self-parodying elements which undercut the tragic interpretations of the lovers’ deaths” (“The Sentimental” 34). While Severin examines the parodic intent of several fifteenth-century authors, she specifically addresses two authors central to the current investigation, Juan de Flores and Diego de San Pedro. Severin detects parodic and game-like intentions from both authors, although she clearly sees Flores as the more ludic of the pair, even calling his work a “literary game” as she states: “The works of Juan de Flores are more obviously ludic than those of Diego de San Pedro because the former’s male audience viewed them purely as a literary game devoid of courtly value” (“The Sentimental” 313).³⁷ For

³⁶ For scholars such as Peter Hutchinson, “Parody is a semi-elitist form of game, a playful, self-conscious reformulation of an existing text in order to accentuate certain characteristics of the original work’s content or style” (92).

³⁷ John T. Cull also sees Flores’s writing as playful and parodic due to its self-conscious nature. In his analysis of Flores’s *Historia de Grisel y Mirabella*, Cull claims that “There can, however, be no doubt that Juan de Flores was intimately aware of the conventions of romance. His narrative simultaneously pays homage to them and parodies them. This kind of ironic and playful self-consciousness, combined with an incipient interest in the psychological

Severin, only certain people with prior literary knowledge could appreciate the ludic nuances of the Sentimental novel. Referring to the evolution of the works of both fifteenth-century writers she explains:

If Diego de San Pedro's sentimental novels were written for a courtly audience which gave them a sophisticated reading in the context of poetic games and religious impieties and parodies, then Juan de Flores takes this step further with works initially designed for an all-male Salamancan audience of sophisticated readers of national and international literature... Flores's works next entered the sphere of the Isabelline court; later they were published for a wider audience, and finally they were translated for an international readership. By the time that they had reached this final stage, both Flores's and San Pedro's novels had lost the exclusive audience which understood the parodic nuances, and they were reinterpreted as serious works representing a serious interpretation of the love ethic of their time. (313)

This idea is explained even further in Severin's, *Religious Parody and the Spanish Sentimental Romance*. In this monograph, Severin clarifies in more detail the particular evolution of *GyG* and how it slowly lost its ludic meaning:

I have developed the theme of the three versions of *Grimalte*, the first for a sophisticated university audience who understand the literary sub-text and the in-jokes, the second with poetry and music by Alonso de Córdoba destined for a court presentation where portrayal of the female characters would have appealed to the ladies of the court, and the last printed version for a larger bourgeois audience where the subtleties of literary parody and

development of his characters and a degree of realism mark the *Historia de Grisel y Mirabella* as an embryonic, but important step in the development of the novel in Spain" ("Irony" 428).

courtly game would be lost to a simpler reading, which would interpret the whole tale in a tragic mode. (66-67)

As Severin indicates, later readings of *GyG* tend to focus on its “tragic mode”. However, earlier readings did allow for, or perhaps were intended to elicit, a ludic interpretation. With parody being established as one key indicator of ludic activity on the part of Flores, the current chapter moves beyond parodic intent and delves even deeper into *GyG* to understand how several other moments in the text can be ludic and playful for both readers and characters alike. Furthermore, Severin’s proposal about the text’s ability to be interpreted by various groups in various ways underscores how easily the lines between play and conflict can become blurred. While one group read a ludic text, recognizing play’s pervasive influence throughout its pages, another group just as easily walked away from the text overwhelmed by the sad and harsh reality that the conflict between lovers created. While the audience’s background can be crucial to the interpretation of the text, it may be fair to all readers to say that the combination of play and conflict throughout the pages of *GyG* makes interpretation more challenging than one may think. Both those that find the text humorous or playful and those that find it tragic may both be correct if one accepts the special reciprocal relationship between play and conflict.

If the ludic nature of *GyG* is less than obvious, it may be due to the fact that, as Severin points out, many have overlooked the original playful intentions of the author. Another reason play may not be apparent is that in modern times the concept of play is associated with pleasure and entertainment. Despite its lighter side, theorists such as Huizinga have also viewed play in the context of war, death, pain, and so on. John H. Kerr clarifies, “Thus, in Huizinga’s view, games were fun, voluntary, joyous, childlike, spontaneous and careless, but at the same time were tense, disinterested, bloody, fatal and illiberal” (32). Kerr elaborates on this dual nature of

play by referring to its “bipolarity”, a term borrowed from Sutton Smith: “Sutton-Smith attempted to demonstrate that all major theories of play (despite the variety of origins: historical, evolutionary, psychoanalytic, anthropological, cognitive, animal, linguistic, communicational or philosophical), conceptualise play as displaying a fundamental bipolarity” (32). This dual nature of play, being both fun and serious, will be important to keep in mind as one navigates between the pleasurable/fun experience of the reader (and some characters), and the anguish filled/serious reality of most characters in *GyG*. We will see how readers and characters experience many of the same key moments in the novel in drastically different ways. Those moments which cause the most stress and anxiety for the characters often provide the most pleasure and entertainment to the reader, and I will argue that both of these contrasting experiences can be defined as play. These moments expose the “dual nature” of play, since they manifest themselves in both serious and light-hearted circumstances.

Before analyzing these “dual nature” moments in *GyG*, it is important to understand how the experience of fictitious characters can connect to the experiences of real-world readers. Understanding play from an ontological/phenomenological perspective, Eugen Fink describes the relationship between the play world and the real world in the following manner:

The play world is not suspended in a purely ideal world. It always has a real setting, and yet it is never a real thing among other real things, although it has an absolute need of real things as a point of departure. That is to say, the imaginary character of the play world cannot be elucidated as a phenomenon of mere subjective illusion, it cannot be defined as a chimera, which were to exist only in the innermost soul without any relationship to reality. (24)

The ludic elements of *GyG* are often found within quite serious moments of the novel. Jacques Ehrmann asserts this same idea of play and seriousness being intertwined by writing: “At the methodological level, play and reality, being inseparable, can only be apprehended globally and in the same movement” (56). Referring to play and communication, Gregory Bateson also describes the relationship between play and non-play activity, stating that “play is a phenomenon in which the actions of “play” are related to, or denote, other actions of “not play.” We therefore meet in play with an instance of signals standing for other events, and it appears, therefore, that the evolution of play may have been an important step in the evolution of communication” (“A Theory” 143). If one is to understand the serious “reality” based elements of the Sentimental novels, they must also understand the ludic foundations which accompany them.

One way to help us find where the ludic intersects with the non-ludic, is to turn to the theory of Michael J. Apter who has proposed a phenomenological approach to play, based on Reversal Theory.³⁸ Apter elaborates on this theory’s idea that humans experience excitement and arousal in one of two ways: in a serious mood, which he calls the “telic” state of mind or a playful mood, which he calls the “paratelic” state of mind (15). Apter believes that in order to identify play, one must know which state of mind that humans are in while experiencing exciting and arousing situations. Apter contends that understanding arousal is “so important in understanding the nature of play” (17). He believes that if one experiences excitement through the help of some form of filter or “protective frame”, then the individual is said to be enjoying the experience and thus, “playing” for pleasure. If, however, the excitement and arousal is experienced with no filter or “protective frame”, the individual may experience high levels of stress and anxiety. Apter summarizes this by stating: “One way of putting all this is to say that in

³⁸ According to Kerr and Apter, “Reversal Theory has been described succinctly as a general approach in psychology which deals with motivation, emotion, personality and psychopathology” (9).

the play-state you experience a protective frame which stands between you and the ‘real’ world and its problems” (15).³⁹ Clarifying how one experiences excitement as play with the help of the protective frame, Apter explains:

So in the paratelic state, within a protective frame, emotions are felt in parathic form.

In this way we can have parathic horror, parathic anxiety, and so on- all of them pleasant forms of emotional excitement. The ‘trick’ of experiencing these rather than unpleasant forms is to maintain the protective frame. (18)

If pleasure is usually experienced in a paratelic or playful state of mind, thanks to the presence of a protective frame, one could assume, at first, that activities experienced in a serious or telic state of mind where no filter is present cannot be considered play. In fact, experiencing excitement and arousal in the telic state can indeed be quite stressful. However, it turns out that while it may not be pleasant or pleasurable, one can also technically play in a telic state of mind. One can play in a game against one’s will for example, or accept a challenge for the reward that it will provide. If we take a closer look at Apter’s theory on play, he states that while not as common, it is “perfectly possible” to play in a telic state of mind (17). In these cases it is not the pleasure of the process, but the desire for the goal which drives the individual to play. Apter clarifies this point by stating: “This is another way of saying that if the result matters beyond the game, then the protective frame is absent and the spirit of the encounter is no longer playful. For this reason, professional rather than amateur sport is more likely to be performed in the telic than the

³⁹ As seen in chapter one, Bateson and Turner have written about frames, specifically, “play frames”. Summarizing Bateson’s play frame, Henry Bial explains: “Gregory Bateson examines the role of play in communication, and of communication in play. Play involves “real” words and actions that are paradoxically “not-real” because they are “framed” within the context of play. Bateson seeks to understand how people do and do not recognize such “frames” and paradoxes as a means toward a greater understanding of the human psyche” (*The Performance* 135). Turner has also written on the concept of a “play frame” stating that “Play frames, to the contrary, depend on the formula “let’s make believe” or “let’s pretend” (*Celebration* 28).

paratelic state of mind” (17). While admitting that one can play in a telic state of mind, we can see here that Apter makes a distinction between playful activities and a “spirit” of play. It is on this one matter that I disagree with Apter ever so slightly as he, much like many modern day theorists, seems to imply briefly that the true “spirit” of play is diversion and entertainment. Not only can play be quite serious, as Huizinga and others have shown, but it can also transcend the labeling of serious and fun to include an explanation of man’s entire being, as theorists such as Fink and Nietzsche have proposed.⁴⁰ In this sense, the true “spirit” of play to which Apter refers sounds more like the modern view that play is primarily “fun”. Nevertheless, to be fair, Apter does confirm that one can play in the telic state of mind and he gives a concrete explanation of the fact that in those cases one is playing for the goal or the prize, not for the enjoyment of play. Therefore, it can be said that Apter’s vision of play fluctuates between goal oriented play (serious with no pleasure) versus play for the sake of pleasure (fun). This distinction between these two types of play is very important to the current study and it will be crucial to keep in mind as we begin to understand how the activities of the readers, as well as those of the characters in the novel, can be considered different forms of play.

Apter’s theory is ultimately describing the two forms in which humans can experience exciting and arousing situations. He therefore provides a variety of ways in which that excitement and arousal can present itself. Apter contends that “One of the most interesting things

⁴⁰ While many theorists have accepted that pleasure and seriousness are two sides of the same coin that is play, some have moved beyond this “bipolarity” of play, and have focused on an even greater binary relationship which produces and is created by play; the process of creation and destruction. Those theorists see the creative and destructive nature of play as the basis for man’s entire existence. The concept of the world being created and destroyed through play has been elaborated by many theorists and schools of thought, though perhaps most relevant to the current chapter are the theories of Eugen Fink and of Nietzsche. Fink takes an ontological/phenomenological approach to play, stating that “Play is an essential element of man’s ontological makeup, a basic existential phenomenon” (19). He later goes on to add that “Play is a creative act, a production. The product is the play world” (26). Also seeing the creative power of play, Nietzsche’s concept of “Artists’ Metaphysics” is described by Babette E. Babich as “a metaphysics presenting the universe under the aspect of a work of art...Nietzsche educes this creative vision of the artist on the basis of the abundance of play” (163). For both theorists play is at the heart of creation and destruction.

about play is the tremendous variety of devices, stratagems and techniques which people can use to obtain the pleasures of play, and especially achieve high arousal” (18). In order to understand how one can become aroused and, “obtain the pleasures of play,” Apter proposes seven different categories of arousal: “Exposure to arousing stimulation, Fiction and narrative, Challenge, Exploration, Negativism, Cognitive Synergy, and Facing Danger” (19-20). Ideally, for a pleasurable play experience, one would encounter these stimulating factors through Apter’s aforementioned protective frame or filter. If that frame is not in place, then any one of these categories could be experienced in the telic state of mind as well. In the telic state, these arousing activities may or may not be play, but if someone experiences these categories in a telic state of mind while also in pursuit of a goal or prize, then we can say that it is indeed “goal oriented play”. All of these triggers for arousal and play can be found in *GyG*, but ultimately they will be divided between the goal oriented play of most characters operating in the telic state of mind versus the pleasure seeking play of the reader who experiences most of the novel in a paratelic mindset.

Upon closer analysis of *GyG*, we will see that all of Apter’s categories of arousal can be detected in Juan de Flores’ text. If these categories are present, then the real question becomes who is experiencing these moments of arousal and play and in what state of mind are they experiencing them? In most cases, the same experience of arousal which can be considered pleasurable for the readers will cause high anxiety for the characters. In either case, whether experienced as pleasure or pain, paratelic or telic, I propose that the experiences found within the novel are directly connected to play due to their high arousal value. In some cases the play will be “play for pleasure” while in other cases the play will be “goal oriented play”, but in each case, play will be present.

Ludic Arousal in *Grimalte y Gradissa*.

Juan de Flores' entire work is constructed on the notion of creating a fictitious narrative. Flores establishes the fact that his work is fiction in the very first line of his text: "Comiença un breve tractado compuesto por Johan de Flores, el qual por la siguiente obra mudo su nombre en Grimalte, la invención del qual es sobre la Fiometa" (3). According to Rivas Hernández, this statement is a sure sign that one is entering into a fictitious world: "Al iniciar la lectura de la novela nos vemos empujados a abandonar el mundo de la realidad, en el que momentáneamente se nos había instalado, para situarnos en un ámbito fictivo" (424).⁴¹ Furthermore, Flores states that what this "obra" will contain is an "invención". The use of the word "invención" too indicates to the reader that the text which is about to follow can be considered fictitious in some manner (Rivas Hernández 424). If any doubt were to remain about the contents of the text being fiction, Flores finishes the first sentence of the novel with a reference to Fiometa.⁴² According to Pamela Waley, "Flores' dependence upon Boccaccio in *Grimalte y Gradissa*, however, could hardly be more explicit. He takes up the story of the *Elegia di Madonna Fiammetta* exactly as it is left by Boccaccio" (xxix).⁴³ There is little doubt that Flores' text is a fictitious narrative, which is a specific trigger for excitement and arousal according to Apter's theory:

⁴¹ For Lacarra, this name change ultimately aids in creating a parody of Sentimental Romance: "En mi opinión, Flores con este recurso señala la precariedad del disfraz que lo convierte en Grimalte y hace conscientes a sus lectores de la engañosa identificación entre autor externo-“auctor” y autor-narrador y entre autor y personaje amador tan característico de las obras sentimentales. Al desvelar la manipulación subraya y parodia la pretendida historicidad de los relatos sentimentales, y señala las diferencias entre creación literaria y apariencia de realidad" ("Juan de Flores" 229)

⁴² Marina Scordilis Brownlee summarizes Flores' continuation of Boccaccio's work by stating: "the *Grimalte* picks up the narrative thread left hanging in the *Elegia* by following the possibility for closure that Boccaccio suggested (and rejected) in Chapter 5- that Fiometa disguise herself as a religious pilgrim" ("The Counterfeit Muse" 123)

⁴³ Giuseppe Mazzotta has analyzed the element of play in Boccaccio's *Decameron* in his book, *The World at Play in Boccaccio's Decameron*. In this text, Mazzotta claims: "The main metaphor through which Boccaccio reflects on

As we have already noted, fiction and narrative can produce, through empathy with the characters depicted, high arousal in the form of such parathic emotions as terror or grief. Thus, in watching the hero in an adventure film trying to escape from some unlikely situation, one can enjoy the arousal without the distress which the hero is supposed to be feeling. (19)

While “fiction and narrative” can cause excitement and arousal, one would have to experience this through the safety of Apter’s “protective frame” (15) in order for it to cause pleasure. In other words, the reader needs to know that what she is reading is indeed fiction. The simple knowledge that what one is reading is fiction should provide an adequate filter for the reader to enjoy what will be contained in the pages of the text. Knowing that the story is a continuation of Boccaccio’s *Fiammetta* would immediately signal to the reader familiar with the Italian work that this story is not based on actual historical events, thus allowing him or her to see things through a protective frame.⁴⁴ Through the help of a name change and an intertextual reference, Flores is not only providing arousal in the form of fiction, but he is also providing the protective frame all at the same time. Flores is clearly setting up a playful and pleasurable experience for the reader through the use of fiction. One could ask if it is possible for Flores to have playfully set up his text and at the same time make it an unpleasant experience for the reader. In theory, he could. Flores could have established the same narrative game that he plays by changing his name to that of a character/narrator, but instead of citing a fictitious story such as Boccaccio’s, he could have used some unpleasant story in local history such as a real war, etc. In that case, a reader who may have had a connection to the real life story would be “playing” along with

the imagination and also organizes his text is a metaphor of play” (7). As Waley points out, Flores clearly was familiar with Boccaccio’s *Elegia di Madonna Fiammetta*. Perhaps Flores was also influenced by the ludic nature of Boccaccio’s *Decameron* as well.

⁴⁴ Fifteenth-century readers would have been familiar with Boccaccio’s text. According to the Ruiz García inventories, Isabel de Castilla owned a copy in Italian.

Flores's ludic introduction, but would quickly have to remember a real life event which may have negative connotations and emotions connected to it. In this scenario the protective frame would be missing. In the case of *GyG*, Flores is clearly signaling to his reader that he is engaging in a form of literary play by blurring the lines between author and narrator and allowing his characters to interact with those from the Italian text. In fact, Rivas Hernández specifically refers to Flores's narrative approach as a "juego" as he states: "El punto de partida de este juego se sitúa en el plano de la realidad, donde Juan de Flores, autor del que apenas conocemos datos biográficos, toma una obra ya impresa, conocida y leída en su tiempo con el propósito de hacer avanzar en la historia a sus personajes" (423). As Rivas Hernández points out in this quote, it is clear that there is a certain game or "juego" being played by Flores by allowing his characters to interact with those from Boccaccio's fictional text. This game of intertextual references entices the reader to play along in Flores' invented world and continue reading. The reader must recognize and accept the rules of this new world created by Flores in which fictional characters from previous texts can be brought back to life. By asking the reader to play along with the rules of his new inter-textual and fictitious invention, and by providing the reader an appropriate filter by letting her know the work is pure fiction, Flores presents his text as play for pleasure.

Not only is the reader impacted by the reference to Boccaccio's *Fiammetta* (in a positive way due to the filter or "protective frame" that its fictitious nature provides), but the characters themselves are deeply affected (in a negative way due to a lack of filter) by the appearance of the fictitious narrative in the text. According to Grimalte, who is now the voice of the aforementioned Johan de Flores, the story of Fiometa's love has at first glance appeared to arouse the emotions of Gradissa as well: "venida su muy graciosa scriptura a la noticia de una senyora mia llamada Gradissa, las ajenas tristesas tanto la apassionaron que ella no menos

llagada que aquella otra se sentía” (3). For Graddissa, the text that she reads is not fiction and thus it affects her world in a very real way. Whether or not Gradissa was truly moved by Fiometa’s story, she quickly uses the Italian lovers’ tale to her advantage and in effect plays with the narrative, turning it around and using it against Grimalte whom she has continuously rejected. The narrator/protagonist affirms: “yo de mas constante y ella de mas cruel ninguno ygualarsenos pudo” (4). Gradissa decides to use the story of Fiometa by speculating that perhaps Grimalte would behave the same way as Pánfilo if given the chance: “Porque quando entera vuestra me hayays, soy cierta sereys a mi hun otro Pamphilo a Fiometa... Y por esto, si culpa alguna me poneys, temor de vuestra mudança me scusa” (4). Given her apparent lack of interest in Grimalte from the very beginning of the text, her “concern”, while valid, appears to be more of an excuse to avoid Grimalte’s advances. In this sense, Gradissa has figured out a way to manipulate and play with the supposed arousal caused by the story of Fiometa to suit her own needs and achieve her own goals. This is goal-oriented play, with the goal being to rid herself of Grimalte. It is possible that she was moved by the story, but unlike a reader enjoying the story from a protective frame, Gradissa uses Fiometa’s tale to affect her world directly.

Most importantly, Flores uses the Italian text to allow Gradissa to create a ludic reality which will contain the rest of the triggers or categories for excitement and arousal previously mentioned by Apter. For example, Apter proposes that one form of creating excitement is through the use of a challenge: “Any kind of challenge can, if accepted, be arousing, the difficulties and frustrations which arise only serving to heighten the arousal yet further” (19). A challenge is the quintessential game (whether experienced in the telic or paratelic frame of mind) with a clear cut manner of determining the “winner”. In fact, Gradissa decides to present Grimalte with a challenge after reading the tale of Fiometa. Gradissa proposes that in order to

win her love, Grimalte must track down Fiometa and help her reunite with Pánfilo: “Assi que por mi contemplación vos pido vuestra persona a tal afán se dispongua, y doquiere que ella sea se busque. Y quando con Fiometa seays, sepa ser vuestra venyda a favor suyo y ruego mio, y por mis males alevianar algun tanto” (5). By presenting this challenge, Gradissa is creating a game-like reality for Grimalte which will soon consume his entire life. Flores’ inclusion (and Gradissa’s invention) of this near impossible challenge for Grimalte is shaping his world in a very ludic way, which will only lead to his eventual downfall. However, Grimalte must play along with Gradissa’s challenge or risk losing her forever. In effect, he is forced to play along if he wishes to obtain the prize. This play can be considered goal oriented play being experienced in a serious or telic state of mind.

While the game-like challenge may be a source of anxiety for Grimalte, it is a pleasurable experience for the reader and it is the driving force behind the rest of the novel. The rest of the text will deal with Grimalte’s attempt to win the challenge and attain his “prize”. The reader finds himself aroused and enticed to play along with Grimalte to see the outcome of the game, all through the protective filter of fiction which the character of Grimalte does not have the luxury of using. The process and the ordeals which Grimalte must undergo are important and pleasurable to the reader, who will experience this entire challenge in the paratelic state of mind. Interestingly, Gradissa also encourages Grimalte to find pleasure in the process of this nearly impossible challenge: “Y no vos fatigue pena de mi presencia austentáros, que con la speranza del gualardon qualesquiere trabajos hos deven ser deleytes” (6). In essence, Gradissa is telling Grimalte that he should approach the challenge in a paratelic state of mind, finding pleasure in both process and the goal oriented outcome. As if to add to the ludic nature of the challenge, Gradissa clarifies Grimalte’s mission with the first appearance of verse in the text:

Si quereys este bien mio,
 Cobrarlo como quereys,
 Hit alla do vos enbio,
 Y fazet quanto podreys. (6)

This is the first appearance of verse in the text. As stated in the previous chapter, Huizinga and others have noted that poetry and music have strong connections to play. Although Haywood questions the possibility of the text being performed for an audience, she does remind us of the entertainment value of verse in the fifteenth-century: “Records from the second half of the fifteenth century suggest that verse and song formed an integral part of court ceremony and entertainment” (“Reading” 140). Verse could be entertaining for the reader, and it seems appropriate for it to appear at the moment that Grimalte’s reality becomes based on a ludic challenge.

Grimalte’s acceptance of the challenge leads to his subsequent search for Fiometa. The protagonist struggles to find her since he has very little information about her whereabouts at his disposal. He explains to Gradissa: “Pues yo, senyora, de vos partido como vuestro querer me manda, a gran pena sabria preguntar a qual tierra o parte queria hyr, salvo descaminando, tomando el propósito de mi partida en la voluntad” (8). Grimalte’s only plan is to set out and explore the world in hopes of finding Fiometa: “anduve rodeando el mundo en busca de aquella tan alexada senyora” (8). In this case, the inclusion of exploration entices the reader to continue reading in order to discover whether or not Grimalte will indeed find Fiometa and attain his prize. While Grimalte discovers Fiometa fairly quickly from the reader’s perspective, this brief moment of the “unknown” can cause a moment of excitement and pleasure for the reader. For

Apter, the concept of exploration is yet another category of arousal which can trigger a playful mood:

Moving off the beaten track into new territory-whether we are talking about the literal territory of the explorer or the metaphorical territory of the artist...is always likely to be arousing. Quite apart from the surprising, novel or unexpected events which can occur as a result of trying something new or facing the unknown, the very fact that one knows one is taking a risk and that the outcome is unclear can heighten the emotions and make one feel more alive. (8)

While Grimalte provides very little information about his exploration, he does something even better by leaving the description to the reader's imagination and promising to tell more once he is reunited with Gradissa as he states:

Y si agora mis affanes encareciesse y servicios despendidos quexasse, al fin Fortuna, que siempre tuve enemiga, daria muy vergonçoso fin a mi proposito, do mas mi pena mostrasse; y do el effecto fuesse ninguno, gran culpa y pequenyo gualardon merecería. Y por esto me plaze complir mis trebaïosas iornadas, porque despues, si ventura me ayudare que vuestro servicio se cumple, podre haver loores de mis obras. Assi que dexadas todas estas cosas para en aquella hora que mejor en presencia que por scripto parecieran, quiero scrivir el lugar donde la senyora Fiometa falle. (9)

Grimalte's exploration sounds like something the reader would like to hear more about, but she must continue reading to see if that information will be provided. This may heighten a reader's interest and excitement, prompting them to continue reading to see what will happen next, and if Grimalte's journey will ever be explained in more detail. This need to use one's imagination and

the excitement and anticipation it provides can cause the reader to experience this brief statement by Grimalte in a paratelic or playful state of mind with the help of the filter of fiction.

On the other hand, this experience of exploration is at first glance quite unpleasant for Grimalte as he states: “Y dexo la admiracion de mi viatge, y por no mostraros que teneys muy grandes cargos de mi, no quiero mis enoios recontaros” (8). The journey would appear to be difficult, and Grimalte was indeed “exploring” as he states. “a gran pena sabia preguntar a qual tierra o parte queria hyr, salvo descaminado, tomando el proposito de mi partida en la voluntad” (8). While the exploration was confusing, Grimalte specifically mentions “el proposito” of his trip. This “purpose” of course is the prize which is attached to a successful outcome of finding Fiometa. Therefore, exploration is just one more component of Grimalte’s ludic reality and overall mission. Through exploration, Grimalte continues to “play” along in hopes of winning Gradissa’s challenge. Given the difficult nature of his “exploration”, and the “propósito” of his trip front and center in his thoughts, it would appear that for Grimalte this activity is goal oriented play experienced in a telic state of mind. However, there is some evidence that Grimalte also tries to take Gradissa’s advice and experience his trials in a paratelic state as well, taking pleasure in the process: “Ni quiero que oyays mas clara mi pena de aquello que con discreto mirar podeys sentir...mas antes me plaze y quiero que por mis obras claresca la claresa de mi fe y voluntad en serviros” (8-9). Grimalte decides to play along with this challenge not only for the goal of “attaining” Gradissa, but also as a way to show Gradissa his devotion. Grimalte is attempting to find pleasure in the process as well as the goal in this challenge, however difficult that may be. Given that he is caught up in a challenge, hoping to win a prize and attempting to enjoy the experience, at this point in the novel Grimalte can be considered to be “playing” in the telic state of mind, and at least trying to play in the paratelic one.

Grimalte wins a small victory in his challenge since he successfully locates Fiometa. Upon Grimalte's encounter with Fiometa, Flores temporarily switches the focus of the story from the interaction between Grimalte and Gradissa to the relationship between Pánfilo and Fiometa. A large part of the latter couple's story would seem to revolve around breaking with social convention and expected behavior. This is a reality which Pánfilo himself reminds Fiometa about in his letter to her:

Mira que ahun que sea a mi muy gran loor una tal persona como tu haver venido a buscarme, asi solo por ser a ti desonesto no me plazen mis loores en tal...caso, pues conozco de tu desseo mas que de tu cordura te dexaste venger. Y dexaste tu noble marido y tal senyoria y casa qual ninguna ygual de ti conozco. Pues ¿como sera posible que persona de tal estado pueda con stranyo hombre en agenas tierras bevir sin que tus parientes y amigos no hayan de proveher sobre ti? Que si tu con el amor demasiado te plaze perder honor, los otros no lo quieren. (21)

Finally getting the chance to hear the details of their rule breaking is quite satisfying and entertaining for the reader, especially if the reader is hoping to compare Boccaccio's and Flores' versions of events. The reader is experiencing the rule breaking in a pleasurable or paratelic state since it is all simply part of the fictitious narrative and has not caused any real-life consequences. Additionally, the rule breaking was quite satisfying for the couple, as Pánfilo states: "yo no menos que tu querria plazer nuevos y dar compañía a los passados deportes" (36). Pánfilo's interaction with Fiometa was clearly a pleasurable experience. Interestingly, Pánfilo had always intended this pleasurable rule breaking to be temporary as he states: "Pero para conservar amor, no debria tener mas termino que hun anyo de seguimiento y medio de possession" (29). This statement clearly shows that Pánfilo was indeed just "playing" with Fiometa. This does not

imply that he was not interested in being with Fiometa, or even sincere at the time as he himself claims, but his quick change of heart does seem to show that he was, in essence, looking for a good time and his rule breaking allowed him that temporary pleasure.

In the case of rule breaking, both readers and characters experience a moment of pleasure by its presence in the novel. Of course, this pleasure does not last quite so long for Fiometa who is immediately affected negatively by these actions when Pánfilo decides to abandon her. All of the couple's flaunting of social conventions can be analyzed in terms of Apter's category of arousal known as "negativism": "Deliberate and provocative rule-breaking-whether the rules are explicit regulations and laws or implicit social conventions and expectations-can be a wonderfully arousing thing to do" (19). Negativism, then, is a form of playing with the rules, temporarily entering into what Turner termed a "liminal" space. As we saw in the case of Ardanlyer and Lyessa in *Sla*, Fiometa and Pánfilo also began their relationship by breaking several "social conventions". Specifically, Fiometa was already married at the time the two lovers met.

Flores follows up the initial story of the two lovers' rule breaking with yet another encounter between the two. After an exchange of letters between the lovers and some convincing from Grimalte, Pánfilo reluctantly agrees to meet with Fiometa. They immediately embrace each other and further flaunt the social conventions against this type of behavior for a married woman such as Fiometa:

Y ellos assi retrahidos, ¿quien podria dezir las graciosas maneras que en este recebimiento passaron? Las quales, ahun que el iuyzio las siente, mi mano especificar no sabe, en special porque el caso consiste mas en actos que en palabras. Pero algo de lo

visto no puedo callar; que no creo dos enamorados iamas mayores hoviesse, ni con tan lindos modos mejior entenderse...y tales eran sus gentilezas que no sabia qual de aquellos loasse, que quadauno procurava por mas agradar al otro. (31)

Not only is the couple playing with conventions and experiencing their passionate moment in a paratelic state of mind due to the pleasure that their actions no doubt produce, but they are also complying with yet another of Apter's categories of arousal: "Exposure to arousing stimulation" (19).⁴⁵ As pointed out in chapter one, Kurt P. Frey also sees "sexual behaviour as a kind of playful behaviour-that is, behaviour which is typically performed in the paratelic state" (55). While Fiometa and Pánfilo are not overtly "naked" or engaged in explicit "sexual behavior", the previously mentioned description by the narrator shows that he struggles to describe or prefers to omit what he sees when the two lovers reunite, but he does specify that the interaction was "mas actos que en palabras" (31), so some physical contact between the lovers does occur. Once again, the narrator leaves the details to the reader's imagination, but he would certainly appear to be describing a passionate interaction between the two lovers, even if it is simply an embrace. This passionate and no doubt sexually driven behavior is not only pleasurable for the characters but it also is quite entertaining for the reader as well, as one finally gets to see an example of the activity that has led to the need for Grimalte's challenge. In essence, the passionate interaction between the two lovers is what has prompted Gradissa to construct Grimalte's ludic reality in the first place. The reader is conscious of the fact that if these two lovers decide to stay together in this moment, that could be the end of the game for Grimalte. Perhaps entering into the playful realm of "as if", the reader can speculate briefly that Grimalte may well be on his way to

⁴⁵ Apter states: "Perhaps the most obvious way of obtaining arousal is to expose oneself to intense and even overwhelming stimulation...the sight of blood or a naked body, for example" (19).

collecting his prize. If the novel were to end with the reencounter, Grimalte would have successfully navigated his ludic reality and would have come out a winner.

A “win” by Grimalte would no doubt be satisfying for him, but Flores has the reader to worry about as well. The narrative continues, and Grimalte must also push forward, moving to the next level of his game-like reality. With Pánfilo all but admitting that he was simply “playing” with Fiometa, thus causing her death, Grimalte is forced to challenge Pánfilo to a duel: “Despues que huvo estas cuytas y muchas otras acabado, hize voto de iamas partir de...ahi hasta entrar en campo con Pamphilo, si ell lo quiziesse aceptar” (57). While Grimalte puts himself in a dangerous situation by proposing a duel, he is also “facing danger” which will result in excitement and arousal. Apter explains: “That danger produces arousal hardly needs to be pointed out, but if such arousal can be experienced within a protective frame we have a potent way of creating enormous excitement” (20). The prospect of Grimalte and Pánfilo engaging in combat can be quite exciting to a reader who will enjoy the benefit of a protective frame of fiction. Grimalte’s search for Pánfilo drives the rest of the novel. The reader continues to read along in order to see if these two will ever meet.

While the reader is enticed to keep reading to see what will happen next, Grimalte continues searching for Pánfilo with the ultimate prize in mind. At first, he is unsuccessful and decides to return home and inform Gradissa of his failure:

Y despues que largos tiempos stovieron perdiendo ya toda la sperança de Pamphilo, yo no sabia a que mas alli atendiesse; y asi como aquellos que por faltas suyas vergonçosos buelven a sus tierras, tal a mi acahecio, que con menos favor que parti me buelvo a los reynos de Spanya y castellana tierra donde yo natural era. Y llegado allí donde la senyora

Gradissa era, el empacho de mi desastrado caso a su servicio me quito de no parecer ante ella, mas con miedo este tratado, con la presente letra, le enbie. (61)

Upon hearing the news of his failure, Gradissa informs Grimalte that she will accept nothing less than full vengeance in order for him to attain his prize: “Asi que sin duda, tanto atormentada estoy de las obras de aquell malvado Pamphilo que sin haver mayor vengança de ell no podria conmigo amaros. Porque si ell sin castigo quedasse, ¿quien escarmentaria a vos?” (63).

Gradissa’s challenge has now become more dangerous and demanding. Grimalte must once again explore the world and put his life on the line, but this time with the added twist of needing to kill Pánfilo. The game has now changed, and the rules have become a bit more complicated. This goal-oriented play has now become a deadly form of play as well, as Grimalte must now kill to win his prize. Grimalte appears to know that this is a nearly impossible challenge and he expresses this through verse:

En esta triste partida
Que me enbias,
Feneceran con mi vida
Tus porfias. (64)

What was once an idyllic challenge to reunite two lovers, has taken a deadly and pessimistic turn now that it requires Pánfilo’s death.

The new rules imposed by Gradissa represent an important shift in Grimalte’s ludic reality and, in my opinion, get to the heart of Flores’ didactic message about the dangers of Courtly Love games. Flores shows us that the Game of Courtly Love may start off as idyllic and playful, but that it can quickly turn into a dangerous activity. The author takes Grimalte from experiencing a ludic and game-like challenge which can be “won” by rekindling the love

between Fiometa and Pánfilo, and he allows the situation to devolve into something, that while still ludic, can be potentially deadly in nature. In the same way that Flores uses the playful concept of a game-challenge to create amorous hope for Grimalte, he just as easily applies the ludic concept of a challenge to the character's destruction as well, showing us just how fickle the Game of Love can be for its players. Showing how playful scenarios within the Game of Courtly Love can quickly jeopardize the safety of the lover by placing him into a game he cannot win is what I believe to be the primary message of Flores' text. The use of playful scenarios to highlight the dangers of love play is also the primary reason that I propose *GyG* belongs within the previously proposed ludic fiction category. From this point in the novel and moving forward, Grimalte's challenge will no longer be simply "difficult", but will ultimately lead to his complete and utter decline.

Grimalte tracks Pánfilo all the way to Asia as he explains: "Asi que, dexada tota pereza y postpuesta tota covardia, a unas partes y otras inquiri, hasta que depues de mucho tiempo, en las partidas de Asia, fin de las tierras todas y mares, me halle, donde de alli adelante ninguno mas alexado se puede ver sin prevenida muerte" (66). When Grimalte's long search does come to an end and he finds Pánfilo in a cave dug out by his own hands, he is surprised by what he finds:

Y depues que Pamphilo fue de la cueva salido, quando le vi, de tan desfigurado facion stava que si no lo hoviera visto delante, ningun humano iuyzio lo podria a ninguna difformidad comparar. Porque todos los senyales de persona racional tenia perdidos por muchas razones, la principal y primera porque luengos tiempos havia que ell hahí habitava en la aspreza de su penitencia. Y esta cosa lo havia mudado en salvaje parecer. (67)

Pánfilo's appearance shocks Grimalte, particularly his "cabellos y barvas" which had grown quite long (67). Grimalte's moment of shock can be considered arousing for character and reader alike, and aligns quite well with Apter's category of arousal known as "Cognitive Synergy", which he describes as "a reversal theory concept which is defined as the experience of incompatible properties in relation to a given identity (person, place, thing or situation)" (20). Certainly, Pánfilo's look is incongruent with his first appearance when Grimalte met him at his father's palace. Describing their first encounter, Grimalte states: "El qual puede quien me huye ser cierto que iamas una palabra de tan gentil parecer no nació, que cierto las ansias de Fiometa con las gracias de Pamphilo tenían muy legítimas causas a sus desseos" (25). In other words, Grimalte knew Pánfilo to be a wealthy, elegant individual, not the wild man that he later finds in the forest. This drastic change can certainly be classified under Apter's recently mentioned category of "cognitive synergy". Elaborating on the shocking nature of synergy, Andrew S. Coulson states that:

as a result of their puzzling, contradictory nature, and the heightened intensity of the contrasting properties involved, synergies are proposed to have the effect of increasing arousal. Consequently, they tend to be sought and enjoyed in the paratelic state (being experienced as 'fascinating', 'magical', or even 'funny' in the case of humour. (72)

As Coulson points out, cognitive synergy is most pleasantly experienced in a paratelic state of mind. Grimalte is indeed "fascinated" by what he sees. However, unlike the reader who can experience this moment of fascination from behind a protective frame, Grimalte experiences this reality in a very serious state of mind.

This experience begins to change Grimalte in a fundamental way and he quickly takes pity on Pánfilo, deciding not to kill him: “vyendo yo su tan manya crueldad, tome sus manos y con las meijores razones que pude, en tal manera lo aconsolova” (67). Moved by what he sees, Grimalte relies on verse once again to state:

Consuela, triste amador,
 Esta vida que padeçes,
 Que por las leyes de amor,
 Dublada pena y dolor
 De la que suffres mereçes.
 Consuelate, si tu eres
 El Pamphilo que desseo,
 Que de la angustia que mueres
 Tanbien yo muerto me veo. (67)

This is an important moment in Flores’s ludic construction as Grimalte admits that he is “muerto”, or in other words, he has failed to win the challenge set forth by Gradissa. Whether out of exhaustion, pity or despair, Grimalte has in effect decided to stop playing the game. This does not imply that he has stopped loving Gradissa, but rather that he has decided to exit the game and suffer the consequences accordingly. Grimalte explains to Gradissa: “Y quien amarte quisiere, sera con la condicion de verse como me veo” (74). He who follows in the footsteps of Grimalte will see himself beaten and unable to ever win the prize he so desperately desired.

This decision to leave the game permanently as the only option available to the character is also the message one learns from Ardanlyer’s ordeal in *Sla*. Ardanlyer was ultimately overwhelmed by the complex Game of Courtly Love and had very few options available to him

once he started to play. Much like Rodríguez del Padrón, Flores is showing that in the end, the ludic and pleasurable reality which is created, or at least sought out by engaging in Courtly Love is ultimately destructive. While some of Grimalte's actions appear illogical at first glance, they become quite understandable in the context of goal oriented play. Grimalte's primary motivation is to obtain his reward for completing the challenge in which he finds himself a key player. He is playing to win, but the cost proves to be too great a burden for him to bear, as evidenced by the fact that he decides to ignore Gradissa's latest challenge and let Pánfilo live. Identifying the various triggers of arousal which are present in play and also found throughout the text, will help us better understand how the readers and characters alike can be said to have ludic experiences, as different as they may be. Whether in pursuit of a goal or for pure pleasure, the arousing elements included by Flores have strong connections to play and help us better understand how one can begin to consider his text as a ludic creation.

Game as Reality in *Grimalte y Gradissa*

The previous section focused on elements of arousal which are common triggers for both goal-oriented and pleasure-seeking play. Identifying these elements of arousal and their connections to play is another step on the road to recognizing Flores' text as having fundamentally ludic qualities, even when those ludic qualities are not initially recognized as such. Play and reality are intertwined and it is not always a simple task to identify the ludic nature of a situation. Ehrmann observes that "the distinguishing characteristic of reality is that it is played. Play, reality, culture are synonymous and interchangeable" (56). If reality is indeed "played", with individuals being "players", then it is possible that many of Flores' characters will

not only have strong connections to play, but to games as well. According to Roger Caillois a culture's games can tell a lot about its society and people:

It is not absurd to try diagnosing a civilization in terms of the games that are especially popular there. In fact, if games are cultural factors and images, it follows that to a certain degree a civilization and its content may be characterized by its games. They necessarily reflect its culture pattern and provide useful indications as to the preferences, weakness, and strength of a given society at a particular stage in evolution. (83)

While there are no obvious "games" being played in the novel such as card games or organized sports, we can find several elements which are imbued with game-like qualities and which have strong connections to games. If a culture can be analyzed by the games that it plays as Caillois suggests, then perhaps the game-like reality created by Flores in the pages of his novel can be analyzed to uncover exactly what type of world he was trying to show us. The ludic world that Flores creates in his novel may very well be a reflection of his own late fifteenth-century reality.

While the previous section of this chapter focused on the various manifestations and permutations of play experienced by readers and characters alike, this section specifically narrows the focus to the four categories of games defined by Roger Caillois in his book, *Man, Play, and Games*. The analysis will show how several aspects of Flores's diegetic world fit within the parameters of Caillois' game categories and can therefore be considered game-like in nature. Caillois explains his division of games in the following manner: "I am proposing a division into four main rubrics, depending upon whether, in the games under consideration, the role of competition, chance, simulation, or vertigo is dominant. I call these *agôn*, *alea*, *mimicry*, and *ilinx*, respectively" (12). Caillois clarifies that the games or activities found within these four

categories are governed or influenced by one of two possible forms of play: either *paidia* or *ludus*. Caillois calls *paidia* the “primary power of improvisation and joy” and describes *ludus* as a “civilizing quality” (27), which requires “an ever greater amount of effort, patience, skill, or ingenuity” (13). In other words, games shaped by *ludus* are more structured than games governed by *paidia*. While Flores’ novel does not contain scenes of organized sports, or even people playing games with dice, the characteristics and fundamental qualities of Caillois’ four game categories, whether influenced by *ludus* or *paidia*, do appear to be present in *GyG*, even in the most “serious” of situations.

A brief explanation of each of Caillois’ four game categories will be helpful before proceeding to an analysis of *GyG*. Caillois’ first category of game is “*agôn*” or competition, which he describes by stating:

A whole group of games would seem to be competitive, that is to say, like a combat in which equality of chances is artificially created, in order that the adversaries should confront each other under ideal conditions, susceptible of giving precise and incontestable value to the winner’s triumph. It is therefore always a question of a rivalry which hinges on a single quality...exercised, within defined limits and without outside assistance, in such a way that the winner appears to be better than the loser in a certain category of exploits. (14)

Caillois defines the second category of games with the term *alea* or chance. Activities in this second group are:

...all games that are based on a decision independent of the player, an outcome over which he has no control, and in which winning is the result of fate rather than triumphing

over an adversary. More properly, destiny is the sole artisan of victory, and where there is rivalry, what is meant is that the winner has been more favored by fortune than the loser.

(17)

Caillois places another group of activities in his third category of games known as “mimicry”, which he describes by stating:

Play can consist not only of deploying actions or submitting to one’s fate in an imaginary milieu, but of becoming an illusory character oneself, and of so behaving. One is thus confronted with a diverse series of manifestations, the common element of which is that the subject makes believe or makes others believe that he is someone other than himself. He forgets, disguises, or temporarily sheds his personality in order to feign another. (19)

Caillois’ final category of games is known as “*ilinx*”:

...the last kind of game includes those which are based on the pursuit of vertigo and which consist of an attempt to momentarily destroy the stability of perception and inflict a kind of voluptuous panic upon an otherwise lucid mind. In all cases, it is a question of surrendering to a kind of spasm, seizure, or shock which destroys reality with sovereign brusqueness. (23)

With these broad definitions it becomes clear that the four game categories proposed by Caillois, *agôn*, *alea*, mimicry, and *ilinx* could be used to classify a wide range of human activities as games. The following analysis will show that many of the actions and words of Flores’ characters have connections to each of these four game categories, and can therefore be considered game-like in nature.

If we turn our attention to *GyG* we see that competition is a key ingredient in Flores' ludic creation. The work begins with the imagery of "combat" and competition between Grimalte and Gradissa, and at least in the beginning, Grimalte appears to have the upper hand as Gradissa states, "¿Quien se podra defender de vuestro continuo seguir? Que si de una parte honestidad me defiende, de la otra vuestras requestas y servicios me vencen" (4). In effect, the entire subsequent challenge set forth by Gradissa is an attempt to regain the upper hand in this amorous competition which she feels that she will inevitably lose. Gradissa explicitly says that this situation cannot continue forever and that she is losing: "Mas porque ya mi crueldad y vuestra mucha porfia no hayan lugar de mas adelante proceder...pues no se ni puedo defenderme" (4). Grimalte seems to know that Gradissa's challenge to him is merely an excuse to get rid of him and be victorious as he responds: "Mas bien parece que la mengua de iusta razon que teneys hyzo que buscaseys scusa para vos e fin para mi vida; que claro esta, segun el empresa...que me mandays tomar, que lo fazeys con speranza de yo nunca bolver, porque quedeys libre y quita de lo que me soys obligada" (7). There is clearly a competitive nature to the relationship between these two. It is interesting to note that although Grimalte appears to be winning this particular competition, he ultimately accepts the ludic challenge presented by Gradissa. He specifically tells Fiometa later on in the novel that he sees the challenge as a battle: "Y asi como aquellos que por desseo de hazer armas batallan contra los de mayores fuerças con honorable speranza de Victoria, no menos yo con bando vuestro para combatir aquell salli de mi tierra y vencerlo iamas tornar en ella" (17). One could be justified in asking, just why does Grimalte accept this challenge when it appears, at least according to Gradissa, that his efforts are beginning to bear fruit?

Grimalte's decision to accept the challenge can also find its roots in a spirit of competition. Caillois reminds us that in a game of competition "The point of the game is for each player to have his superiority in a given area recognized" (15). By accepting Gradissa's challenge, Grimalte is temporarily allowing Gradissa to take the upper hand in their competition of wills, ceding her some level of control in hopes of ultimately showing his superior skills at love and devotion. This self-imposed hardship may best be described by Caillois' description of competition among children and adolescents who "try to prove their greater endurance" by subjecting themselves to "severe ordeals" (16). Grimalte's mindset does appear similar to Caillois' description of these young individuals that voluntarily suffer in order to prove their abilities. The adolescents' decisions, as well as Grimalte's acceptance of Gradissa's challenge, can best be described by a spirit of competition.

This competitive spirit is highlighted once again in Grimalte's attempt to enter into combat with Pánfilo when he states, "yo armado combatir me quiero con vos" (58). Much like Ardanlyer in *Sla* who entered into tournaments to prove his worth, Grimalte too must face Pánfilo in a duel, due to the "spirit of *agôn*. Caillois indicates that "In addition to games, the spirit of *agôn* is found in other cultural phenomena conforming to the game code: in the duel, in the tournament, and in certain constant and noteworthy aspects of so-called courtly war" (15). Given Grimalte's competitive interaction with both Gradissa and Pánfilo, we can say that he demonstrates the "spirit of *agôn*" and it is his willingness to engage in competitive behavior which really serves as the driving force behind the novel. Grimalte's competitive nature obligates him to attempt to win over Gradissa despite her repeated rejection; it motivates him to accept her challenge, and it pushes him, quite literally, half way across the world in pursuit of Pánfilo. Competition is an important component of Flores's ludic creation.

In addition to competition, fortune and destiny figure prominently throughout Flores's novel, particularly in the development of Grimalte's challenge. With fortune's strong connection to play and games, it should not be surprising that Flores relies heavily upon fortune to create Grimalte's ludic challenge. Even before embarking on his journey, Grimalte questions whether or not fortune will allow him to achieve his goal of helping Fiometa: "Y a mi seria muy grande cosa si la Fortuna quisiese que el lohor que fasta aqui ella tiene merecido por su gentil razonar, que agora por mi rudeza no lo perdiesse" (7). With this statement, Grimalte appears less than confident in his own skills and would appear to admit that fortune will play a large role in winning his prize. Grimalte once again recognizes the role of fortune when he encounters Fiometa: "Y Fortuna, viendo mi soffrimiento sobrar a su crueldad, plugole un dia entre los muchos tristes passados aleviarme, porque una dama en aparado pomposo y honesto antoios por los cruzados caminos vi entravessar" (10). Grimalte's skill alone will not suffice to overcome Gradissa's challenge. He is fully aware of the fact that he must also depend on fortune in order to win his prize.

Referring to games of chance or fortune, Caillois points out that "*alea* is total disgrace or absolute favor. It grants the lucky player infinitely more than he could procure by a lifetime of labor, discipline, and fatigue...*Agôn* is a vindication of personal responsibility; *alea* is a negation of the will, a surrender to destiny" (17-18). This same concept of surrendering to destiny can be seen once again when Grimalte attempts to console Fiometa: "Pues si Fortuna os es agora contraria, despues que saber sufrir os conozca, podra muy presto bolver la rueda, como aquella que solamente a los fuertes prueba y con los flaquos se ensanya" (51). Here Grimalte's vision of fortune is seen as a cyclical game of chance when he mentions that it may "bolver la rueda" (51)

and change Fiometa's luck.⁴⁶ This view of fortune as cyclical and dependent on waiting for a lucky break appears to be in line with Caillois' vision of *alea* when he states:

The player is entirely passive; he does not deploy his resources, skill, muscles, or intelligence. All he need do is await, in hope and trembling, the cast of the die. He risks his stake. Fair play, also sought but now taking place under ideal conditions, lies in being compensated exactly in proportion to the risk involved. (17)

Like a game of chance, fortune cannot be predicted, and all one can do is hope for the outcome to be favorable.

Despite his view of fortune being out of his control, Grimalte does urge Fiometa to fight against it when things do not go her way: "Pues sforçat contra la Fortuna y con discreto mirar combatit a vos misma" (49). In other words, due to Grimalte's competitive nature, and perhaps realizing he is in the middle of trying to win a challenge, he does find it possible to fight against fortune and win. With Grimalte's advice to fight against fortune, we see that Flores relies upon a mix of both competition and fortune to create his characters' experiences. The fact that Grimalte appears to rely on both skill and chance may not be surprising given that Caillois states that competition and fortune have a special relationship with one another since they create a ludic environment of equality for players: "Agôn and *alea* imply opposite and somewhat complementary attitudes, but they both obey the same law-the creation for the players of conditions of pure equality denied them in real life" (19). The fact that two elements like

⁴⁶ For more information on the wheel of chance in fifteenth-century Iberian texts, see Colbert I. Nepaulsingh's chapter entitled, "The Magic Wheel of Fortune" in which he elaborates the role of fortune in *Siervo libre de amor*, *Cárcel de amor*, and *Celestina*. According to Nepaulsingh, "the word 'fortuna' was closely associated, especially in fifteenth-century Spain, with the word 'rueda'" ("Towards" 183).

competition and chance should figure prominently in shaping Grimalte's world vision should be no surprise given that he is in the midst of a challenge which he hopes to win.

Competition and Chance are not the only game elements found in Flores' text. While not as prevalent as *agôn* and *alea*, there are important examples of Caillois' category of mimicry found throughout the novel. Referring to mimicry, Caillois states: "In one way or another, one escapes the real world and creates another. One can also escape himself and become another. This is *mimicry*" (19). With this broad definition, we can say that Flores' own actions fit the description of mimicry. As was previously mentioned, Flores does "escape the real world" at the beginning of the text, and does indeed "become another": "Comiença un breve tractado compuesto por Johan de Flores, el qual por la siguiente obra mudo su nombre en Grimalte" (3). As we saw previously with Rivas Hernández's analysis, Flores is engaging in ludic activity by openly changing his name to that of Grimalte.

Flores offers an example of mimicry yet again with his description of the aforementioned actions of Pánfilo. We saw in the previous section of this chapter how rule breaking, and the pleasure that it can bring, may account, in part, for Pánfilo's actions. However, in order for him to engage in the rule breaking, Pánfilo does need to rely on certain elements of mimicry. According to Caillois, an individual engaged in mimicry "forgets, disguises, or temporarily sheds his personality in order to feign another" (19). This would appear to be how Pánfilo explains his own behavior with Fiometa:

Pero estonçes, como fuera de mi sentido, dezia mi simple parecer, y agora que enteramente conozco la razon, virtud y conçiencia me obligan desenganyarte de las cautelas que aquell cruel y tyranno amor enganya a los que lo quieren seguir. Y no creas

que en aquell tiempo otra cosa de la que dezia tenia en la voluntad, mas antes no menos creya mis palabras que tu misma, que el amor tan bien a mi como a ti enganyar supo. (35)

It certainly seems that Pánfilo forgot the logic and wisdom which would seem to characterize him so well in his second reunion with Fiometa. Whether on purpose or caught up in the moment, Pánfilo temporarily takes on a different personality. In effect, Pánfilo's actions had a playful or ludic quality to them due to their deviation from his more standard and logical view of the world. The fact that his temporary change in personality has strong connections to mimicry does not in and of itself imply that he was not sincere at the time, but rather his behavior was in a sense game-like and ludic. Now that he is speaking from a position of "razon, virtud y conciencia" (35), he can recognize that he was, in fact, simply playing when he was with Fiometa.

Perhaps the most overt and memorable example of mimicry in the novel is Grimalte's imitation of Pánfilo, who has turned into a wild man. Grimalte describes his own transformation in the following manner: "E fuyme a lo mas spesso de aquell boscaie, adonde mis vestidos me despoie, y commence a tomar possession de aquell tan triste bevir y morada; y las manos puestas por el suelo en la manera que aquell andava, siguiendo sus pizadas, tomandolo por maestro de mi nuevo officio" (69). Grimalte decides to mimic the actions of Pánfilo.

Grimalte's mimicry provides a spectacle not only to Pánfilo, who breaks his vow of silence upon seeing Grimalte's actions, but also to the readers interpreting this unusual event. One will recall that Weissberger sees the world upside down theme in *GyG* as carnivalesque and particularly amusing to fifteenth-century women who would see reversal of traditional gender roles in Grimalte's actions. In this particular case with Grimalte's mimicry, the reversal may also

simply be captivating since it is a sudden transformation from courtier to wild man status. Caillois explains that with mimicry “The pleasure lies in being or passing for another” (21). As we saw in the previous section of this chapter, pleasure is an important component of Flores’ literary efforts. While Grimalte is experiencing a moment of pain and despair, the reader may find a moment of pleasure and fascination as she reads about this transformation which can best be described as a spectacle. Caillois notes the performative nature of mimicry as he states: “Mimicry is incessant invention. The rule of the game is unique: it consists in the actor’s fascinating the spectator, while avoiding an error that might lead the spectator to break the spell” (23). Grimalte’s performance is an intentional signal to Pánfilo and to the reader that something drastic has occurred in Grimalte’s pursuit of his prize. In other words, with his mimicry, Grimalte is declaring that he will be exiting the Game of Courtly Love permanently.

With his choice to mimic Pánfilo, Grimalte has changed games. He has gone from a ludic reality filled with competition and chance created by Gradissa, to one of imitation controlled by himself. Much like Ardanlyer in *Sla*, Grimalte has chosen to abandon the game-like reality of Courtly Love which only offers intense competition and possible death to its participants. He no longer needs to “battle” against fortune, or Pánfilo, but rather in this new game of imitation he is in complete control of his own actions. Fate no longer controls what he will do, but rather a strong sense of *ludus*, that is, a strong sense of organized rules dominates his actions as he must imitate Pánfilo’s movements to be successful. There is a very specific set of activities that he must do in order to master this new game of mimicry. He must dress and walk the same way that Pánfilo does. Not very difficult rules to be sure, but he does consider Pánfilo his new “maestro” who is showing him how to be a wild man (69). This new game of imitation is much safer and much more controlled than the dangerous game that he was playing during Gradissa’s challenge.

Having failed in the game of love, Grimalte is slowly decelerating, perhaps even devolving into easier and more basic forms of play and games.

Grimalte's slippage into simpler forms of play continues in the final moments of the novel as his actions begin to resemble Caillois' final category of games called *ilinx* which can, "destroy the stability of perception and inflict a kind of voluptuous panic upon an otherwise lucid mind" (23). Grimalte spends the night in the cold mountain weather exposing his body to harsh conditions: "por no haver acostumbrado yo de andar asi desnudo, sentían las carnes las fuerças de los muy agudos vientos" (71). Perhaps due to the extreme conditions, or perhaps attributable to his mental anguish, Grimalte sees visions of Fiometa in the afterlife right before his very eyes:

Pero esto me era vicio a comparacion de las spantables visiones que en aquella noche nos perseguian. y estas, alli seguras en la spessa montanya, espantosos gritos bueltos con Dolores...y gemidos de Fiometa ohiamos. Y deque a nosotros fue mas acercuada esta vision, tan acompanyada la vimos de gentes abominables que a mi el grande espanto que tenia dellas no me las dexo mirar; porque la diformidad de sus rostros era tan sin medida que sus mudanças y llantos me desfiguraron que no la trabaiosa vida passada. (71)

Grimalte and Pánfilo are certainly exposing themselves to a mind-altering experience. Are these visits from beyond the grave or intentional attempts to conjure up mental images in a deliberate attempt at altering their minds and bodies by suffering through the harsh climate? While certainly not having fun, Grimalte's actions are strongly connected to games of *ilinx* which are pleasurable to the participant. In this case, the reader, through the filter of fiction, gets to enjoy this "moment of panic" which is sought through games of *ilinx*. Grimalte, on the other hand, must endure these mind altering visions.

One may recall that competition, and even mimicry, were governed by a sense of *ludus* or a sense of rules and control. In the case of games of *ilinx*, it is *paidia* which takes center stage. Caillois explains: “there also can be no connection between *ludus*, which is calculation and contrivance, and *ilinx*, which is a pure state of transport” (31). Grimalte has gone from a highly structured challenge with strict rules, to activities governed completely by a sense of free play in the form of *paidia*. Flores has brought Grimalte full circle, all through the use of play. Relying on the creative qualities of play, Flores uses the game-like elements of competition and chance to construct Grimalte’s world with the help of Gradissa’s challenge. Just as it can create, play can be destructive, and Flores relies yet again on play to signal Grimalte’s downfall. The organized and competitive play of the courtier ultimately proved to be too much for Grimalte who regresses to a more basic form of mental play.⁴⁷

If, as Caillois suggests, “there is a reciprocal relationship between a society and the games it likes to play” (82), then what do the game-like elements in *GyG* tell us about the world created by Flores? In a previous quote it was mentioned that Caillois stated that games could also reflect “preferences, weakness, and strength of a given society” (83). The society fashioned by Flores does indeed find both its strength and weakness in the game-like reality created by Grimalte’s quest for Courtly Love. On the one hand, game-like activities strengthen and harden Grimalte’s resolve in the form of competition, while at the same time, those same game-like realities like fortune and *ilinx* can signal the individual’s weakness and eventual surrender.

⁴⁷ If one compares the progress of Grimalte through Caillois’ game categories with the actions of the character Leriano in *Cda*, which will be analyzed in the following chapter, it will be seen that both protagonists follow an opposite or inverse path to their own destruction. While Grimalte begins his journey with competition and ends with a game of *ilinx*, Leriano will begin with *ilinx* and end with competition. Leriano is first presented in a mind altered state as a prisoner of love in the allegorical world influencing his mind. With the help of the Auctor, Leriano will then rely on mimicry, then chance, and finally, when all else fails, he will turn to competition in the form of all out war with the King. Leriano eventually realizes that all of his efforts are in vain, and like Grimalte, will choose to exit the Game of Courtly Love.

The current chapter began with the premise that Flores' text, as Weissberger, Severin, and others have noted, has a ludic side. The analysis attempted to move beyond the overt moments of parody and comedy to show that play is found intertwined throughout all areas of the text, particularly in areas not traditionally considered ludic. Relying on theories elaborated by Apter, the analysis first considered the shared ludic experience of both readers and characters. Though experienced in fundamentally different ways due to the filter of fiction, both readers and characters were shown to be playing in either the paratelic or telic states of mind. Play, then, is the common denominator which urges both readers and characters to move forward through the text.

Once inside the diegetic world of the narrative, it was shown how the same concepts which govern Caillois' categories of games such as competition, chance, simulation, and vertigo, also influence characters' behaviors and realities, giving their actions and motivations a game-like quality to them. The analysis showed that Grimalte, much like Ardanlyer from *Sla*, was overwhelmed by the conflictive consequences attached to the Game of Courtly Love, choosing to exit it rather than continue the fight. If games can tell us about a society as Caillois suggests, then the game-like qualities found throughout *GyG* may also reflect the previously described ludic environment of Isabel's court. Given the ludic activity which could take place at court, combined with the fact that Courtly Love itself is often considered a serious, high stakes game, and it seems plausible to consider that Flores' text, so imbued with play and game-like elements, could be reflecting his fifteenth-century reality. As noted earlier, it would appear that the message about play and games is that they ultimately lead to the decline and destruction of the player. Therefore, Flores' text may very well be ludic, but as suggested in chapter one with *Sla*, *GyG* too

may be more of a *reprobatio ludi*, warning the reader to avoid, or at least be aware of the play and games that one will encounter, and possibly be consumed by, in a courtly setting.

CHAPTER THREE: PLAYING THE GAME: STRATEGIC POSITIONING IN *CÁRCEL DE AMOR*

The previous chapter highlighted the ludic experiences for both readers and characters alike woven throughout Juan de Flores' *GyG*, thus calling for a categorization of the work as a ludic text. In terms of character interaction, Flores constructed his work almost entirely upon the concept of Gradissa's easily recognizable challenges, complete with benchmarks for Grimalte's success or failure, and bearing many of the same characteristics of a game with a prize as the ultimate goal. Grimalte was given two clear challenges: first to reunite the two Italian lovers, and second to kill Pánfilo once he rejected Fiometa. In order to be victorious, Grimalte's situation required intelligent action, but ultimately involved very little strategic planning. His success or failure hinged upon his ability and willingness to play along with Gradissa's demands, not his capacity to strategize.

In contrast to the game played in *GyG*, chapter one's analysis of *Estoria de dos amadores*, the intercalated story found within *Sla*, presented the notion that certain types of games can be more complex than a simple challenge, requiring the need for well thought out strategy to be victorious. The deadly game played between Ardanlyer and his father King Creos demonstrated that success may ultimately depend on properly anticipating the actions of others. This more strategic approach to game play is also present in Diego de San Pedro's *Cda*, a work

written during the reign of Isabel de Castilla.⁴⁸ Unlike King Creos and Ardanlyer who engaged in a more basic game of attack and defense on an international stage, *Cda* presents characters with both complementary and competing interests navigating inside the court of Macedonia and vying for the chance to impose their will and shape the outcome of events.⁴⁹ This multidimensional reality in *Cda* produces more strategizing and more complex competition between characters. As indicated in chapter one, an analysis of the competitive nature of characters can bring to light the traces of play and games in the text.⁵⁰ Specifically, chapter one utilized Huizinga's theories to understand the concept of competitive play.⁵¹ Building from the idea that competition is ultimately a form of play, the current chapter analyzes *Cda* utilizing a Game Theoretical approach, similar to chapter one's treatment of *Estoria de dos amadores*. The analysis in chapter one revealed that scholars such as Enric Mallorquí-Ruscalleda have already begun to see Game Theory as a useful tool for understanding characters' motivations in medieval and early modern Hispanic Literature.⁵² However, given the more intricate nature of the play and character interaction found in *Cda*, and recognizing arguments about the limitations of Game Theory when multiple overlapping interests are present, the current chapter will also incorporate parts of

⁴⁸ José Francisco Ruiz Casanova explains the limited details that we have about San Pedro, asserting: "Hasta ahora sólo puede afirmarse que San Pedro vivió en la segunda mitad del siglo xv, que estaba vivo en 1501, y que compuso sus obras no antes de la década de los setenta (*Cárcel de Amor*, en 1483, o después), aunque fueron impresas en la última década del siglo" (12).

⁴⁹ For a detailed discussion about the evolution, reception, and materiality of *Cda*, see Emily Francomano's article, "'Puse un sobrescripto' [I Wrote a New Cover]: Manuscript, Print, and the material Epistolary of '*Cárcel de amor*'". In this article Francomano suggests that *Cda* most likely circulated in manuscript form among early courtly audiences (36).

⁵⁰ In fact, the courtly audience of San Pedro's work may very well have been accustomed to searching for a ludic meaning within texts. One may recall that chapter two presented Dorothy Sherman Severin's claim that the readers of Diego de San Pedro's text were "a courtly audience which gave them a sophisticated reading in the context of poetic games and religious impieties and parodies ("The Sentimental" 313).

⁵¹ Huizinga states: "We can well say that an essential part of the play-concept is concealed in the field of operation of the *agon*" (*Homo Ludens* 49).

⁵² In his study of *Celestina*, based on the Game Theory model, Mallorquí-Ruscalleda mentions in a footnote the potential for applying such a theory of games to Courtly Love, proposing that "Sería muy iluminador escribir un estudio de la transformación de las reglas del amor cortés desde la teoría de juegos, ya que aportaría datos muy reveladores sobre su periodización" (601). While it is outside the scope of this project to study the "transformación" of Courtly Love, some conclusions about Courtly Love will be reached by applying a game theoretical model to *Cda*.

Thomas C. Schelling's theory on strategy to more fully flesh out the motivations and strategy of characters in *Cda*. Contextualizing characters' competitive and conflictive activities as part of a complex strategic game will help to illuminate how the conflict/play phenomenon is at the very core of the Spanish Romance genre.⁵³

The strategic interaction between characters in San Pedro's *Cda* frequently involves the Auctor, a contested and ambiguous figure who blurs the line between being both a narrator and a character. As the story begins, the Auctor is returning home to Spain after the War of Granada. His travels take him through the kingdom of Macedonia, where he meets Leriano, a nobleman captured by the allegorical character named Desire. Leriano is led to the *cárcel de amor*, a mental representation of his suffering caused by his love for the king's daughter, Laureola. After a brief exchange between the Auctor and Leriano, the former agrees to deliver a message to Laureola on Leriano's behalf at the court of Macedonia. Taking pity on Leriano, Laureola reluctantly responds with a letter, which the Auctor and Leriano interpret as a favorable sign, prompting Leriano to quickly make his way to court to see the object of his desire. While there, a rival noble named Persio suspects an amorous connection between Leriano and the king's daughter and, driven by jealousy, lies to the king about the two having a secret and inappropriate relationship. This prompts the king to imprison his daughter, and Leriano is forced to clear his and Laureola's good names. His failures lead to armed conflict with the king, and only on the brink of losing against the king's continuous siege is the truth finally discovered. Despite proving his innocence, Leriano does not fulfill his desires and after elaborating on the virtues of women, passes away after drinking a cup filled with the torn pieces of Laureola's letters.

⁵³ One may recall from chapter two that Langbehn attributes Weissberger with highlighting "dimensiones lúdicas" as an important trait of the Sentimental genre by stating: "En cuanto a la novela sentimental, Weissberger logra perforar un estrato de malentendidos que hacía de ella un género solemne y serio con ocasionales deslices grotescos, haciendo valer sus dimensiones lúdicas como fundamento de la interpretación" ("Un mundo" 125).

As the description of the plot shows, *Cda* draws inspiration from the concept of Courtly Love. In his discussion about Courtly Love in San Pedro's text, Bruce Wardropper states: "La *Cárcel de Amor* prolonga en la España de la tardía Edad Media la tradición del amor cortés" (171). More recently, scholars such as Robert Folger have not only identified the presence of Courtly Love in the text, but also propose that its inclusion serves as a "vehicle" for self-construction: "In *Cárcel*, this somber story is essentially the vehicle for other forms of self-constitution which are parasitic in relation to courtly love" (*Escape* 18). Folger states that "*Cárcel* calls attention to the fact that texts were (or could be) instrumental in shaping subjectivity...*Cárcel* models a new form of parasitic-identificatory constitution of the subject and novel writing and reading practices" (*Escape* 16). Agreeing with Folger's basic premise that there can be a "parasitic" self-construction in connection to the Courtly Love story found within *Cda* (*Escape* 18), this chapter extends that concept and proposes that *Cda* also realizes the construction of a ludic self, constituted through the Courtly Love narrative found within San Pedro's text. Although Folger does not specifically propose the construction of a "ludic self", the foundation of his argument would seem to support such a finding since he relies upon the importance of performance, an activity which chapter four will demonstrate is strongly grounded in play, and its role in what he calls the, "game of courtly love":

Since the dispersed subject is predicated on 'seeing' and 'being seen,' he is essentially a product of performance, particularly in the courtly sphere. For the noble self, the game of courtly love has the function of ostentating noble breeding and soliciting benevolent gazes that ratify the projected self. (*Escape* 18)

In other words, playing the Game of Courtly Love directly contributes to the construction of the self. If that is the case, it is natural to at least consider the possibility that part of what is being constituted in the Game of Courtly Love is, in fact, a ludic self.

Seeing Courtly Love as a form of game is certainly not unheard of. Richard Boase has stated that “Courtly love was a manifestation of the play element in culture” (103). Summarizing Boase’s views of Courtly Love as a game, Julian Weiss explains:

He records the views of scholars who, from Huizinga on, argue that courtly love may best be understood as a form of game-playing, since it comprised elements common to all games, such as: duplicity (players are self-consciously both agents and spectators); uncertainty (the game depends upon suspense); illusion (players pretend to be other than they are); commitment (players abide by conventions); and secrecy (the use of an obscure vocabulary comprehensible only to initiates). (241)

Words like “duplicity”, “uncertainty”, “illusion”, and “secrecy” cited by Weiss to describe the components of both games and Courtly Love also describe the characteristics of Sentimental Romances more generally.

In his review of Marina Brownlee’s *The Severed Word*, E. Michael Gerli appears to confirm that the feelings of “uncertainty” or “illusion” are indeed part of the Sentimental Romances when he states: “In the romances, nothing seems to refer to what is intended, meanings are frustrated, characters are misconstrued, codes break down, grammars are confused, readers are thwarted, and all standards of signification are ceaselessly challenged in both implicit and explicit ways” (“Señora” 241). Gerli goes on to add that this feeling of confusion also made its way into Iberian courtly society as well, stating that “the whole epistemological environment

of Iberian courtly society is shot through with the same preoccupation... This perception of ambiguity, polysemy, and concealment is unavoidable when culture begins to cultivate, and to speculate consciously, upon, language” (“Señora” 243). In Gerli’s view, this confusion of reference does not limit itself to literature, but is a phenomenon found throughout fifteenth-century Iberian courts. Gerli contends that this “confusion”, had a large part in shaping Iberian courtiers’ world views, asserting: “The problematic of reference in the sentimental romances are but a small side of a much bigger, intricately complex lens through which Spanish courtly culture viewed the world” (“Señora” 243). It is within this context of a court struggling with a “problematic of reference” and seeing the world through a “complex lens” that Gerli analyzes the appearance of Diego de San Pedro’s *Cda*.

Perhaps part of what made fifteenth-century Iberia such a complex world to navigate was the abundance of conflict between nobles. In his study of political conflict in medieval Castile, José Manuel Nieto Soria stresses the prevalence of conflict between Castilian nobility, but also reminds the reader that understanding these political confrontations can lead to a better appreciation of fifteenth-century Castilian culture:

La contemplación de los sucesivos conflictos políticos que se encadenan a lo largo de la evolución de la Castilla bajomedieval, en particular si nos referimos a la época trastámara, nos ofrece una excelente oportunidad para poner en valor lo que fue su formalidad. A partir de la consideración de esa formalidad, resulta factible establecer una relación más estrecha entre transformaciones culturales y dinámica conflictiva. (54).

Many scholars have seen *Cda* as a reflection of this real world conflict described by Nieto Soria. Scholars such as Francisco Márquez Villanueva, Barbara Weissberger, and Sanda Munjic have tried to find real world political concerns reflected in the novel.⁵⁴ Villanueva states:

Como libro escrito en un momento históricamente crítico (no muy anterior a su fecha de edición en 1492) por un espíritu muy medieval a quien toca vivir los primeros años de una nueva era, no dejan de acusarse en ella preocupaciones de índole muy concreta y cuyos alcances entran de lleno en el terreno de la crítica política y social. (185)

More specifically, José Luis Gastañaga-León sees the text as a commentary on the power of the crown, asserting that “*Cárcel de amor* nos muestra las consecuencias amargas de la lucha política vinculada a la sucesión; además de ser prueba del descontento que la concentración excesiva de poder en la corona despertaba entre los letrados” (810).

In her own study of *Cda*, Weissberger also sees the political and social concerns reflected in Sentimental novels like San Pedro’s, asserting that “the “novela sentimental” and the “novela política” are but two sides of the same cultural coin, put into circulation in order to legitimize the dominance of the aristocracy at a time of rapid social and political change (“The Politics” 309). Weissberger believes that the Sentimental novel is ultimately an attempt to preserve masculine power as she asserts that “Castilian courtly literature of the second half of the fifteenth century reveals an intensified self-consciousness, a heightened cultural need to legitimize aristocratic masculine power” (“The Politics” 309-310). Sanda Munjic also elaborates on the theme of masculine power concerns and ties this concept back into the idea of game play by suggesting

⁵⁴ In her article entitled, “Discourses of Power in the *Cárcel de Amor*,” Maureen Ihrle detects another power struggle between humanists and scholastics. Ihrle states: “the work can be better understood as a literary dramatization of rhetoric, of how rhetoric could and should be used in Renaissance Spain where, as in other parts of Europe, humanists and scholastics engaged in intense debate over the relation of words and texts to truth” (1).

that Leriano's supposed suffering is part of an intentional "masochistic game" (214). Munjic explains: "By identifying Leriano's behavior as masochistic we can analyze the mechanisms of power that underlie the representation of love as suffering in this romance" (205). Boase also noted this tendency for courtly lovers to intentionally disadvantage themselves in the midst of the game: "The courtly lover clearly played to lose, often creating obstacles to fulfillment" (106). Boase's assertion would appear to match with Sanda Munjic's observations about Leriano's intentional suffering all being part of some well-planned social game to bolster one's status and prestige.

Munjic's description of Leriano's "masochistic game" (214), which allows him to increase his noble masculine stature, also finds resonance with Folger's belief that the "game of courtly love" was an opportunity to perform and engage in self construction (*Escape* 18). Chapter two of this thesis also presented the concept of intentional game-playing and drew a connection between the Game of Courtly Love and the court of Isabel de Castilla.⁵⁵ While the term "Courtly Love" can be traced to Gaston Paris in the late nineteenth-century (Boase 1), scholars have clearly detected concrete ties between Courtly Love activity and games at the Court of Isabel de Castilla. Taking the assertions made by Munjic, Weiss, and Macpherson about the real world manifestations and consequences of Games of Courtly Love, and it becomes difficult to ignore the linking of Courtly Love games with political and cultural concerns of fifteenth-century Iberia.

⁵⁵ Ian Macpherson concludes that "The play element-love is a game, poetry is a game-was there as a component from the outset, and became one of its prominent features during the reign of the Catholic Monarchs" (97). Furthermore, Macpherson stated that "The Play element in Courtly love...is taken seriously by a high proportion of the players" (99).

Comparing politics and culture to games was found throughout the Middle Ages, particularly in connection to the game of chess. In her Introduction to *Power Play: The Literature and Politics of Chess in the Late Middle Ages*, Jenny Adams explains:

Allegorists went even farther than players, pushing the similarities between the game and society beyond the simple resemblance of social roles. For writers such as Jacobus de Cessolis and the anonymous author of *Les Echecs amoureux*, or the *Chess of Love*, chess in the late Middle Ages became a way to model political order as well as a way for individuals to imagine their own civic identities. (3)

Making an Iberian connection to King Alfonso X's thirteenth-century treatise on the game of chess, Adams states: "As evinced by Alfonso's chess book and by *Walewein*, writers capitalized on the game's mimetic qualities. Although these generically different works are separated by language and geography, both emphasize the ties between the game and the political order" (4). As Adams' statement indicates, likening politics and culture to a game of chess would appear to be a practice found on the Iberian Peninsula and elsewhere during the Middle Ages. Adams suggests that not only did medieval culture utilize the chess metaphor to describe itself, but that it did so eagerly: "That medieval culture *wanted* to see itself in the game is most indicative in the changes Western players and writers made to the pieces and the rules" (2). In fact, commenting on the appearance of Luis de Lucena's 1497 chess treatise entitled *Arte de ajedrez con CL juegos de partido*, Weissberger suggests the possibility of a direct correlation between Isabel de Castilla and the changing rules of chess:

It is perhaps a measure of the marginalization of Iberia in modern cultural history that no one has related the transformation of the Queen's power in chess sometime between 1475

and 1496 with the unprecedented strengthening of royal authority simultaneously being effected by a historical queen who was decidedly a queen regnant and not a queen consort. (*Isabel*153)

In addition to drawing connections between Isabel and the game of chess, Weissberger also ties Lucena's chess treatise to his parodic Sentimental text, *Repetición de amores*. The two texts were physically bound together, and Weissberger asserts that the combination of chess treatise and parodic Sentimental work highlights masculine anxieties in the face of such a powerful queen. Weissbeger's analysis underscores the important point that "chess is a common motif in medieval romance and poetry" (153), and that the game spawned an entire "genre known as the chess morality" (154). Linking Lucena's treatise on chess with his Sentimental text not only reminds us that people in late medieval Iberia could view their world in terms of a strategic game, but that they could specifically link that game-like reality to the realm of Courtly Love.

While it may not be possible to state directly that San Pedro was definitively inspired by this medieval interest in chess, I do suggest that the concept of strategy involved in chess, where an individual must plan and anticipate an opponent's moves, can be found throughout *Cda*, and that deeper insight into the text may be gained by examining the work as a strategic game. This is particularly true when one considers Adams' assertion about the connection that people of the later Middle Ages made between politics and chess. A work like *Cda*, analyzed so extensively for its underlying political commentary, may best be viewed and deciphered through a ludic lens.

Approaching politics as a game is not restricted to the later Middle Ages, or to the specific game of chess. In his work, *Serious Games*, Clark C. Abt gives a general description about how many important political and social areas of life can be considered a game:

Political and social situations can often also be viewed as games. Every election is a game. International relations are a game. Every personal argument is a game. Whether these contests of politics, war, economics, and interpersonal relations are played with resources of power, skill, knowledge, or luck, they always have the common characteristics of reciprocal decisions among independent actors with at least partly conflicting objectives. (9)

While Abt allows for a wide range of human activity to be viewed as a game, each example appears to have within it the element of conflict or contest. The tendency to use play to represent conflict is what Brian Sutton-Smith refers to as the “rhetoric of play as power” (10), which he describes in the following manner: “The rhetoric of play as power is about the use of play as the representation of conflict and as a way to fortify the status of those who control the play or are its heroes. This rhetoric is as ancient as warfare and patriarchy. It is an anathema to many modern progress- and leisure- oriented play theorists” (10). As Sutton-Smith explains, power and conflict may not be the first connection a modern-day reader will make with the concept of play. However, citing Huizinga and others who see contest and war as grounded in play, Sutton-Smith clarifies: “Most of these works about play as power refer to either one or both of the two most important forms of contest in society: those of physical skill and those of intellectual strategy” (74). For Sutton-Smith, “physical skill” and “intellectual strategy” are the key components to analyze when studying human competition in terms of play and games. While *Cda* does have its share of battle and demonstrations of “physical skill”, the text is truly filled with examples of “intellectual strategy”, and thus the current chapter will apply the ancient

“rhetoric of play as power” (Sutton-Smith 10), described by Sutton-Smith, and focus on the strategy implemented by the characters to highlight the ludic nature of the text.⁵⁶

Analyzing strategic decisions in *Cda* may be difficult without some set of basic rules, expectations, or assumptions about the game, and/or about how other players will or should behave. As recently seen with the theories of Weissberger and Munjic, one assumption made throughout this study will be that players will attempt to retain or acquire power in order to impose their own will or desire. While the pursuit of power is more of a goal and not a rule *per se*, this reality would indicate that characters should take other characters’ pursuits of power as one possible factor or parameter in the game. The analysis will show that this is not, however, always taken into consideration by all characters, usually to their detriment. Primarily, this is due to the fact that many characters are relying solely on pre-established codes of courtly conduct already in place in medieval courtly society, or what could be called the “rules of the game”. In fact, Bruce Wardropper believes that one must examine these rules of conduct to understand *Cda*, stating: “Los problemas sentimentales, en esta visión del cautiverio de Leriano, se encuadran en el marco de los códigos de conducta de la Edad Media” (171). Wardropper goes on to specifically list these “codes of conduct” present in the sentimental world: “el sentimiento reina en *Cárcel de Amor* sin posible competidor. Para conocer la verdadera naturaleza del mundo sentimental es necesario conocer el papel desempeñado por cada código: amor cortesano, caballería, honor, virtud; y estudiar sus discrepancias y antítesis” (173). As Wardropper indicates, there can certainly be “discrepancias” in these codes of courtly conduct. Although characters often consider these “rules of conduct” while making decisions, they rarely restrict their “play” or activities to the confines of these courtly codes.

⁵⁶ The concept of physical skill, which is the second of the “important forms of contest in society” elaborated by Sutton-Smith, will be a central theme of chapter four’s study of *Amadís de Gaula*.

As discussed in chapter one, making decisions based on what others should or may do is an important part of Game Theory. The appeal of Game Theory is that it can help to illuminate the motivations behind actions in politics as well as several other areas of human interaction and behavior where strategy is involved.⁵⁷ *Cda* has been considered a “novela política” by Weissberger and others, and there is no doubt that there is a substantial amount of activity based on self-interest between the characters, making the novel a good candidate for such a game theoretically driven analysis.

As illustrated in chapter one, Steven J. Brams has seen great potential in applying Game Theory to literature in general, especially in terms of understanding a complex plot. Brams has stripped Game Theory of its complex mathematical equations and terminology and made plot “front and center” (“Game 51). He ranks preferences or options using the terms “best”, “next best”, “next worst”, and “worst” with each preference given a value of 4, 3, 2, or 1 respectively. While players will have a “best” or “most preferred” option, they often must settle for a lower value preference based on what their opponents do or may do in the future. Furthermore, traditional Game Theory generally divides most games into two types of games: zero-sum games and non-zero sum games. Brams describes zero-sum games as “games of total conflict,” or games “in which the preferences of the players are diametrically opposed” (*Biblical* 17). In contrast, Brams describes non zero-sum games as “games of partial conflict,” or games “in

⁵⁷ In a game theory driven analysis of Poe’s “The Purloined Letter,” Peter Swirski gives a very good general summary of the game theoretical model. Swirski states: “To recapitulate, GT is a mathematical theory of strategy that aims to optimize the decision-making process in situations where the respective results of each agent’s actions are, at least to some degree, *interdependent*. One may even say that GT is a theory of making interdependent decisions. The players involved in a strategic encounter need not always be individuals, as long as the similarity of their goals and preferences makes it possible to treat them as such. To facilitate analysis, GT uses the fiction of rational players, who seek better outcomes according to their preferences, in view of the anticipated rational choices of other players in the game. A strategy describes a complete plan of action for a player for all possible contingencies that may arise during the course of the game. The actions executed by the players, called moves, are taken independently, in the sense that the players are assumed not to be able to coordinate their decisions beforehand. However, as we saw above, in another sense the player’s decisions are interdependent, since each arrives at his decision on the basis of the anticipation of what other(s) will do” (73).

which the preferences of the players are neither diametrically opposed nor fully coincidental” (*Biblical 23*). While many characters find themselves in zero sum games of “total conflict”, which means players will attempt to do as much harm as possible to their opponents in order to achieve their goals, they often behave as though they are involved in non-zero sum games or “games of partial conflict”, which involve some level of cooperation to reach a common or similar goal. Most characters play the “games of partial conflict” quite well and quite logically, but generally fail to realize that they are or should be playing “games of total conflict”.

While Game Theory can be applied to both “total conflict” and “partial conflict” situations, there are critics that feel that the theory is not nuanced enough to fully explain situations of “partial conflict” which often involve shifting and overlapping interests and motivations. For example, Thomas C. Schelling points out the strengths and weaknesses of Game Theory by stating:

On the strategy of pure conflict-the zero-sum games- *game theory* has yielded important insight and advice. But on the strategy of action where conflict is mixed with mutual dependence- the nonzero-sum games involved in wars and threats of war, strikes, negotiations, criminal deterrence, class war, race war, price war, and blackmail...traditional game theory has not yielded comparable insight or advice...Traditional game theory has, for the most part, applied to these mutual-dependence games (nonzero-sum games) the methods and concepts that proved successful in studying the strategy of pure conflict. (83)

Schelling’s main argument would appear to be that Game Theory tends to have a one size fits all approach to both zero-sum games and nonzero-sum games, or what Brams refers to as “games of

total conflict” and games of “partial conflict”. The solution favored by Game Theory is the “maximin” solution which Shubik explains in the following manner: “For two-person zero-sum games...the maximin solution, which entails maximizing on the assumption that your opponent will do you as much harm as possible, is a normative solution. It is suggested that this is the way a rational man *should* play” (15). For Schelling, the assumption that an opponent wishes to do as much harm as possible is not always adequate when dealing with nonzero-sum games, since often the motivation in these interactions is more complex than simply wishing for the complete destruction of the other player. Schelling does not deny the element of competition found in non zero-sum games, but sees true cases of “pure conflict” as rare as he explains:

Pure conflict, in which the interests of two antagonists are completely opposed, is a special case...For this reason, “winning” in a conflict does not have a strictly competitive meaning; it is not winning relative to one’s adversary. It means gaining relative to one’s own value system; and this may be done by bargaining, by mutual accommodation, and by the avoidance of mutually damaging behavior. (4-5)

It is because of this more nuanced view of nonzero-sum games that Schelling builds off of Game Theory and develops his own theory of strategy. Schelling asserts that, “a study of conscious, intelligent, sophisticated conflict behavior-of successful behavior-is like a search for rules of “correct” behavior in a contest winning sense. We can call this field of study the *strategy* of conflict” (3).⁵⁸ Referring to what he calls “strategic moves”, Schelling states:

⁵⁸ Schelling points out in a footnote that he has taken the term “strategy” directly from Game Theory as he states: “The term strategy is taken, here, from the *theory of games*, which distinguishes games of chance, and games of strategy, the latter being those in which the best course of action for each player depends on what the other players do” (3).

A strategic move is one that influences the other person's choice, in a manner favorable to one's self, by affecting the other person's expectations on how one's self will behave. One constrains the partner's choice by constraining one's own behavior. The object is to set up for one's self and communicate persuasively to the other player a mode of behavior (including conditional responses to the other's behavior) that leaves the other a simple maximization problem whose solution for him is the optimum for one's self, and to destroy the other's ability to do the same. (160)

Schelling's theory of conflict and strategic moves can be a useful tool for understanding the game-like quality of interaction between the characters in *Cda*, especially when those interactions resemble nonzero-sum games. With this context in mind, I will include elements of Game Theory as well as Schelling's theory of strategy to better understand and decipher the strategic interaction of characters in San Pedro's novel.

Six Strategic Scenarios

In order to highlight the strategic and game-like interactions included in San Pedro's work, I have identified what I believe to be six crucial decision making moments in the text, which I label as strategic scenarios one through six. Each of these instances presents a character at a crossroads where he or she must make a decision regarding what is in his or her own best interest. Furthermore, all of these scenarios are intimately linked together, as decisions made in one scenario ultimately establish the existence and the parameters of the next. Like a game of chess, a move or a decision in one scenario ultimately reconfigures the playing field, influencing

options and strategies available to players in the next round. An application of Brams' modified approach to Game Theory, as well as Schelling's thoughts on strategy will help to demonstrate that characters act as players in a game, making well thought out moves and taking others' motives and possible actions into account before deciding on a course of action. I have also chosen these specific moments in the text because I contend that they contain the potential for two types of games being played out in the same episode: total conflict and partial conflict games. I showcase in each scenario how some characters are playing games of "total conflict", and thereby by inflicting as much harm as possible on their opponent, while others are playing games of "partial conflict", and thus cooperating in some way with another player. Knowing the type of game that characters are engaged in, or should be engaged in, is not only beneficial to the characters, but also to the reader attempting to comprehend actions within the novel. While other interactions in the text may be equally game-like, recognizing the moments with the possibility for two potentially juxtaposed game formats may help illuminate and clarify the previously mentioned "perception of ambiguity" and "polysemy" which Gerli attributes to the Sentimental novel ("Señora" 243). In other words, I suggest that it is the presence of a dual game reality which causes confusion for characters and ultimately leads to the tragic ending of the text. This supports my claim that San Pedro's work, like Rodríguez del Padrón's and Flores', is a warning against the dangers of excessive ludic activity connected to the Game of Courtly Love.

Further inspired by Brams' approach to Game Theory, I will also present a series of tables in the discussion of each strategic scenario. These tables will summarize the choices available to characters involved in a particular scenario and serve solely to enhance comprehension by visually mapping out the characters' strategic options and benefits already discussed in my analysis. I have also limited myself to six strategic scenarios for practical

purposes. It should be stated from the outset that it is entirely possible to find additional or alternative moments in the text which are equally deserving of a strategic analysis. Additionally, whenever possible, the analysis identifies the options available to a character based on textual evidence, but since San Pedro did not specifically list every option available to his characters, some speculation about characters' preferences is unavoidable. In these cases, reasonable expectations for a fifteenth-century character/person are included. Although admittedly subjective by its various nature, judgments about what is "reasonable" for a character to do will ultimately be based on what can be gleaned from San Pedro's description of characters' thoughts and behaviors as well as general expectations for fifteenth-century courtly behavior. Since "reasonable" can vary from one individual to another, it is entirely possible that the reader may disagree with certain assumptions or may very well consider alternative options available to characters that are not discussed here. In fact, the consideration of alternative opinions inspired by a game theoretically driven analysis is also discussed by Brams, who welcomes additional permutations of his own findings by stating:

Where the reader disagrees with assumptions I have made about who the players in a game are, what strategy choices were available to them, the outcomes that they saw as possible, or their preferences for these outcomes, I urge him to experiment with different assumptions. The game-theoretic framework, in my opinion, should not be rejected out of hand simply because there are alternative-if not superior-strategic representations of the situations that I have presented. (*Biblical* 9)

Following Brams' formulations, I too suggest that the reader may experiment with or speculate about alternative assumptions not considered in my analysis. In this sense, the six strategic scenarios presented here are intended to open up a dialogue about the strategic, game-like nature

of the text, not necessarily represent a definitive or exhaustive list of all possible “moves” within the game.

The first strategic scenario in the novel, which I label Strategic Scenario # 1, is the Auctor’s decision to help Leriano, who makes his request for help at their very first encounter: “Caminante, por Dios te pido que me sigas y me ayudes en tan grand cuita” (65).⁵⁹ Leriano is very specific about what he wants from the Auctor: “No te pido otro bien sino que sepa de ti Laureola cuál me viste” (73). The Auctor’s first move appears simple: tell Laureola that he has seen Leriano. However, the Auctor soon learns that his decision to help this individual is more than a simple request, but will instead put him in direct conflict with Laureola, who has rejected Leriano in the past. In other words, the Auctor initially believes that Leriano is setting him up in a game of “total conflict” with Laureola, and he details his concerns about this situation immediately:

Mándasme, señor, que haga saber a Laureola cuál te vi, para lo cual hallo grandes inconvenientes, porque un ombre de nación estraña ¿qué forma se podrá dar para negociación semejante? Y no solamente ay esta dubda, pero otras muchas: la rudeza de mi ingenio, la diferencia de la lengua, la grandeza de Laureola, la graveza del negocio. Assi que en otra cosa no hallo aparejo sino en sola mi voluntad. (74)

It is clear from the the Auctor’s hesitation and “dubda” that he recognizes the need to proceed with caution and his listing of possible future obstacles demonstrates his propensity for strategic thinking. And yet, despite the dangers of potentially entering a total conflict scenario with someone with the “grandeza de Laureola” (74), the Auctor does rather quickly agree to help out

⁵⁹ José Francisco Ruiz Casanova’s edition of *Cda* will be used throughout this analysis.

this stranger that he has just recently encountered during his travels (75). Considering the Auctor's initial hesitation, one could speculate about why he decides to help a stranger that he has just met along the side of the road. Despite the Auctor's claims about the "rudeza" of his "engenio" (74), I would suggest that the Auctor may have made a careful assessment of the situation, including the benefits to himself, as well as a thorough consideration of Laureola's possible reactions, before making his decision.⁶⁰

In order to better understand the Auctor's actions, I evaluate them using Brams' scale of "best" to "worst" options. Given the Auctor's apparent desire to help Leriano and his stated fears and "dubda" about confronting someone with the stature of Laureola, it is safe to assume that his "best" option would be to help Leriano and receive no punishment. Of course, one should keep in mind that the Auctor is a stranger in a foreign land. The Auctor has no real obligations or loyalties to Leriano other than the pity that he feels for him, and perhaps the benefits he would gain from having such a powerful friend. It is not unreasonable to assume that avoiding punishment and not helping Leriano would be his "next best option", after all, he hardly knows the man, and he would essentially "break even" with this choice, neither gaining nor losing a thing. While not a particularly attractive option, his "next worst" option would be to assist Leriano and suffer any harsh consequences which may arise. At least with this strategy he can say that he did try to help, even if it is at extreme expense to his own safety. If he survives, he may even still receive a benefit from his powerful friend Leriano. Of course, the "worst" possible

⁶⁰ This line of thinking also finds strong affinity with Goffman's notion of "rational decision-making", which he explains in the following manner: "Individuals typically make observations of their situation in order to assess what is relevantly happening around them and what is likely to occur. Once this is done, they often go on to exercise another capacity of human intelligence, that of making a choice from among a set of possible lines of response. Here some sort of maximization of gain will often be involved, often under conditions of uncertainty or risk. This provides one sense in which an actor is said to be "rational," and also an ethically neutral perspective from which to make judgments concerning the desirability and advisability of various courses of action. *Rational decision-making* is involved" (*Strategic* 85-86).

scenario would be not helping Leriano at all and yet somehow still receiving a punishment from Laureola when he visits the court.

For the Auctor to truly assess the situation, he would need to consider Laureola's possible reactions to his visit. He can only guess her *possible* reactions and cannot consider what she actually does later on in the novel. After all, the Auctor has not even met Laureola at this point in the narrative and he can only base his judgment on what he knows or hears from Leriano. For now, the Auctor can only presume that since Laureola has already rejected Leriano in the past, her "best" option would be to hear nothing about Leriano and punish nobody. This would be the simplest situation and most beneficial to her honor. However, the Auctor knows that if confronted with a message from Leriano, Laureola would need to decide whether to punish the messenger or not for their brazen behavior. If her honor is the most precious commodity that she has, which Laureola later confirms and the Auctor could safely assume about a princess, she may need to think twice before punishing someone and thus publicizing any suspicions about a possible amorous relationship. Though her initial personal desire may be to punish someone for attempting to speak on Leriano's behalf, her most preferred strategy, in this case her "next best" strategy, would be to avoid punishing the individual and to maintain discretion in this matter, at least initially. Her father later imprisons her just based on an accusation, so there would likely be a negative reaction from her father if he were to hear she was punishing someone in connection to a proclamation of love. Only in the most extreme circumstances would she want to elevate the danger to her honor and publicly punish Leriano's intermediary, and so that would be her "next worst" option. Finally, it is quite unlikely that she would choose her "worst" option, which in this case would be punishing someone that did not jeopardize her honor. All indications are that

Laureola is a kind and compassionate individual and not prone to the random punishment of others.

In order to visually summarize the various permutations of the Auctor's preferred outcomes, along with his assumptions about Laureola's preferences as well, I have included the following table, which borrows from Brams' simplified ranking system, labeling outcomes from "best" to "worst". I have also included Brams' approach to including basic "payoff" amounts or a numerical representation of the benefit next to each option with "best" outcomes assigned a value of 4 while "worst" outcomes receive a 1. This is a basic, yet concrete way of measuring the value of each option and can help to illuminate which characters are "winning" or have the advantage in a given encounter.

Strategic Scenario # 1 Preferred outcomes

Auctor's preferred outcomes:

1. Deliver Leriano's message and receive no punishment. (Best option value 4)
2. Not deliver Leriano's message and receive no punishment. (Next best option value 3)
3. Deliver Leriano's message and receive punishment. (Next worst option value 2)
4. Not deliver Leriano's message and receive punishment. (Worst option value 1).

Laureola's preferred outcomes:

1. Hear no message and punish no one. (Best option value 4)
2. Hear from a messenger about Leriano and not punish the messenger. (Next best option value 3)

3. Hear from a messenger about Leriano and punish the messenger. (Next worst option value 2)
4. Never hear anything about Leriano and still punish someone. (Worst option value 1)

Reviewing his options and Laureola's possible reactions, the Auctor could reasonably assume that if he decides to deliver the message, Laureola would be forced to choose between her "next best" or "next worst" options. If he assumes that she is a rational player, he can expect her to choose her "next best" option and not punish him. After carefully weighing the available options, which are heavily influenced by the role of honor at court, a rational decision by the Auctor would be to attempt to help Leriano. He will receive maximum value for this decision, a 4 on his list of preferred outcomes. Oddly enough, Laureola will be forced to choose a strategy high on her own list of preferences which will give her actions a value of 3 on the visual table included above. Of course, these "preferences" are imposed on her by the concept of honor, but in terms of this particular exchange, they continue to be her preferred outcomes. In this case, Laureola is forced to settle for actions with a value of 3, which are clearly better than her alternative choice which has a value of 2. In effect, the Auctor knows that he and Laureola will have a common interest in avoiding his punishment. Although he is clearly setting her up for a total conflict scenario since her life is on the line, the Auctor would be confident that Laureola would engage in a game of cooperation or a game of "partial conflict" with him. The weakness in Laureola's defenses is that on the surface it appears more beneficial for her to avoid publicly punishing the Auctor, and instead cooperate with him to some degree. Armed with this information, the Auctor decides to help Leriano and makes his first move by explaining: "Pues viéndome tratado della

como servidor, parecióme que le podría ya dezir lo que quisiese” (76). The Auctor approaches Laureola and mentions Leriano’s suffering.

Laureola responds by stating: “Así como fueron tus razones temerosas de dezir, así son graves de perdonar. Si, como eres de España, fueras de Macedonia, tu razonamiento y tu vida acabarán a un tiempo. Así que, por ser extraño, no recibirás la pena que merecías” (77-78). The Auctor was correct, and Laureola has decided to go with her “next best” option of keeping the matter a secret. Through the Auctor’s subsequent conversations with Laureola, the reader learns that all of the Auctor’s possible assumptions were correct. Laureola does not want to hear about Leriano, nor does she want to publicize the issue. We also learn that she does consider punishment an option, but time and again she only uses it as a threat and never actually goes through with it. Describing the characteristics of a threat, Schelling states: “The threat differs from the ordinary commitment, however, in that it makes one’s course of action conditional on what the other player does. While the commitment fixes one’s course of action, the threat fixes a course of reaction, of response to the other player” (124). In other words, Laureola has decided to cooperate with the Auctor in this situation, and by merely threatening him, has left the next move up to him. In effect, the Auctor has won this first round against Laureola by achieving his objectives without punishment. He has managed to force Laureola into the game of his choosing and has avoided a total conflict confrontation with the princess, despite putting her very life in jeopardy.

Knowing the princess’ preferences and concerns, it should be no surprise that in the Auctor’s very next encounter with her, which I label strategic scenario #2, he makes the same cost benefit analysis and approaches her again with a similar message from Leriano. The following list of preferred outcomes and responses is identical to Strategic Scenario #1:

Strategic Scenario # 2 Preferred outcomes

Auctor's preferred outcomes:

1. Deliver Leriano's message and receive no punishment. (Best option value 4)
2. Not deliver Leriano's message and receive no punishment. (Next best option value 3)
3. Deliver Leriano's message and receive punishment. (Next worst option value 2)
4. Not deliver Leriano's message and receive punishment. (Worst option value 1).

Laureola's preferred outcomes:

1. Hear no message and punish no one. (Best option value 4)
2. Hear from a messenger about Leriano and not punish the messenger. (Next best option value 3)
3. Hear from a messenger about Leriano and punish the messenger. (Next worst option value 2)
4. Never hear anything about Leriano and still punish someone. (Worst option value 1)

With renewed confidence and a greater willingness to risk his life, the Auctor once again chooses his "best" option and eventually decides to speak with Laureola in a second encounter:

hízele otra habla, mostrando miedo, puesto que no lo tuviese, porque en tal negociación y con semejantes personas conviene fengir turbación; porque en tales partes el despachado es avido por desacatamiento, y parece que no se estima ni acata la grandeza y autoridad de quien oye con la desvergüença de quien dize; y por salvarme deste yerro hablé con ella no segund despachado, mas segund temeroso. (79)

By following the same risk assessment from his first decision, the Auctor could safely conclude that Laureola would not punish him, and so he made another bold attempt to persuade her of Leriano's love. In fact, the Auctor once again has made a correct calculation for he states: "Su respuesta fue de la forma de la primera, salvo que ovo en ella menos saña, y como, aunque en sus palabras avía menos esquividad para que deviese callar, en sus muestras hallava licencia para que osase dezir" (79). Her response is basically the same and shows even less indication of any pending punishment for the Auctor. Laureola's threats have lost their credibility and she continues to engage in a game of partial conflict or cooperation with the Auctor.

Perhaps realizing that Laureola will not follow through with her threats, the Auctor finally decides to test the princess' limits and delivers a letter from Leriano, which I label Strategic Scenario #3. Still seeing no change in her options, or preferences from their first encounter, the princess accepts the letter and merely becomes angered and threatens the Auctor once again. The various options and the cost benefit analysis of the Auctor and Laureola are identical to Strategic Scenarios #1 and #2, though now the letter has replaced the verbal message:

Strategic Scenario # 3 Preferred outcomes

Auctor's preferred outcomes:

1. Deliver a letter and receive no punishment. (Best option value 4)
2. Not deliver Leriano's letter and receive no punishment. (Next best option value 3)
3. Deliver Leriano's letter and receive punishment. (Next worst option value 2)
4. Not deliver Leriano's letter and receive punishment. (Worst option value 1).

Laureola's preferred outcomes:

1. Receive no letter and punish no one. (Best option value 4)
2. Receive a letter from Leriano and not punish the courier. (Next best option value 3)
3. Receive a letter from Leriano and punish the courier. (Next worst option value 2)
4. Never receive anything from Leriano and still punish someone. (Worst option value 1)

Hoping to help Leriano even further, and still betting on the fact that Laureola will choose her “next best” option, the Auctor daringly decides to give Laureola a letter from Leriano. Her response only confirms that while punishment is still a supposed option, Laureola is most likely not going to use it: “En tanto estrecho me ponen tus porfías que muchas vezes he dubdado sobre cuál haré antes: desterrar a ti de la tierra o a mí de mi fama en darte lugar que digas lo que quisieres” (83). Although she mentions punishment, which has now been reduced to being thrown out of the kingdom and doesn’t seem quite so harsh given the fact that the Auctor is not from that land to begin with, Laureola also begins to blame herself for the Auctor’s behavior. Perhaps the blame that Laureola places on herself is a recognition that she has chosen to play the wrong type of game with the Auctor.

Though only great harm can come to Laureola if their actions are discovered, she has decided to continue playing a game of “partial” conflict, which in most cases can be considered a game of “cooperation” as well, especially when common goals are shared. While Laureola justifiably feels forced into playing a game of cooperation with the Auctor, I would suggest that she may have been better off engaging in a game of total conflict by punishing him from the start. This is especially true when considering that later in the novel, her interactions with the Auctor and Leriano cause her to wind up publicly accused and imprisoned anyway. While publicly punishing the Auctor could have been counterproductive by drawing attention to her honor, there may have been other alternatives as well. For example, there is no indication that

Laureola tries to strategize any further in order to give herself more options, or to change the nature of the game within which she finds herself. Unlike the strategic actions of the Auctor later in the novel, Laureola does not consult her uncle, or the queen, or the cardinal, all who rush to her defense later in the story. There is no indication that she sought alternative ways of dealing with this situation to strengthen her own position. Three consecutive times she unilaterally decides to engage the Auctor on his terms instead of finding a more appropriate way to bring the full weight of her or her father's power down on him and turn the interaction into one of total conflict. By recognizing the existential threat which the Auctor's actions present (her future death sentence), she may have stood a better chance at "winning" had she responded with full force to the Auctor's original move. However, Laureola does not seem interested in a conclusive "win", nor does she attempt to end the game decisively, but instead allows the situation to escalate to her own detriment. She decides to dabble, ever so slightly, in the Game of Courtly Love. This is not an attempt to simply "blame" Laureola for her actions, after all, as I will discuss shortly, she believes that she is choosing her best option to maintain her honor in the face of the Auctor's unwelcomed messages. Instead, my observation is intended to elucidate the fact that she has entered into the wrong type of game with the Auctor, and more importantly, that she has allowed herself to be strategically outmaneuvered by him. For a princess who will one day be queen of the kingdom, as she indicates in her final letter to Leriano (129), this lack of strategic foresight could be problematic for her reign. After all, she allows a foreigner to walk right into her father's court and manipulate her almost completely, encouraged to do so no less, than by her supposedly loyal subject Leriano. The reader can't help but wonder if more strategic foresight may have changed the course of events in Laureola's favor.

Laureola's decision is due, in part, to the constraints of honor and the society around her. The concept of honor, which was supposed to hold society together, has hindered Laureola's ability to make the right move in this strategic interaction, resulting in a threat to the peace and stability of the kingdom. This could easily be a commentary on the role that honor plays in the decisions of a monarch, and especially a female monarch such as Isabel de Castilla, who was in power during the creation of San Pedro's work. *Cda* clearly shows that honor is a double edged sword, easily wielded by courtiers to manipulate actions and reactions of monarchs. San Pedro could very well be commenting on the limitations which old codes of honor would place on a monarch such as Isabel, who would oversee the historical expansion and evolution of the Castilian realm in the late fifteenth-century. Of course, these socially imposed "honor restraints" could prove equally problematic for a male or female monarch the moment they began interfering with strategic decisions which would benefit the kingdom of Castile. And while San Pedro may have been underscoring the limitations which honor places on strategic decision-making, he could just as easily have been commenting on the need for monarchs to be better versed in the art of strategy in general. After all, as we will see shortly, these strategic shortcomings are not limited to Laureola, but instead extend to her father as well. Despite all of the King's attempts at thoughtful deliberation later in the text, he is still outmaneuvered and forced to play the wrong game by one of his supposedly loyal subjects. This indicates a larger, more wide-spread problem with the strategic decisions being made in the Macedonian Court. In all of these cases, Courtly Love and its consequences hinder the monarch's ability to make the best decision for the safety, stability, and peace of the kingdom.

Laureola's poor strategic thinking will continue throughout the text. Having been outflanked by the Auctor's astute siege on her resolve, Laureola feels compelled to respond to

Leriano's written message with a letter of her own. Though she fears the consequences, and continues to state her opposition to her own actions, Laureola does decide to write Leriano a letter. I label this decision as Strategic Scenario #4. Despite the negative consequences and implications of her actions, an analysis of her choices will reveal that she did in fact make the best strategic decision given the restraints that she feels are present in her life. In other words, for a person that believes herself to be "stuck" in a game of cooperation, she makes the most logical moves possible.

The need for Laureola's decision is sparked by Leriano's letter, in which he specifically asks her for a one-time "galardón":

Si por ventura te plaze por parecete que no se podría remediar sin tu ofensa mi cuita, nunca pensé pedirte merced que te causase culpa. ¿Cómo avía de aprovecharme el bien que a ti te viniese mal? Solamente pedí tu respuesta por primero y postrimero galardón. Dexadas más largas, te suplico, pues acabas la vida, que onres la muerte, porque, si en el lugar donde van las almas desesperadas ay algún bien, no pediré otro sino sentido para sentir que onraste mis huesos" (89)

With this request, the princess is then left with a simple decision about whether to ignore the letter or write Leriano and grant him his wish. Laureola decides to write the letter. However, unlike her previous encounters with the Auctor, Laureola's decision includes not only her concerns about her honor, but also the health and stature of Leriano. These added factors make Laureola's decision, and list of preferred strategies, a bit more complex to map out than the initial three strategic scenarios previously presented, and so a brief consideration of all three

factors in this situation, honor, health, and stature, is in order before finalizing a ranked list of preferences.

As in previous encounters, Laureola's honor is her primary concern. Writing the letter poses a danger to her honor by providing physical evidence of her interaction with Leriano, a fact that she reminds him about in her correspondence: "Por Dios te pido que embuelvas mi carta en tu fe, porque si es tan cierta, como confieras, no se te pierda ni de nadie pueda ser vista; que quien viese lo que te escribo pensaría que te amo y creería que mis razones antes eran dichas por disimulación de la verdad[d] que por la verdad" (91). While honor was clearly one factor in her decision-making, it would appear that Leriano's health is also of great concern to Laureola. This is evidenced by the fact she specifically mentions his wellbeing in her dispatch: "más te escribo por redimir tu vida que por satisfacer tu deseo" (90). Knowing in hindsight that Leriano quickly recovers and makes his way to court to see Laureola, the princess' belief that Leriano may have been dying of love sickness could seem naïve. For the reader, the subsequent rapid change in Leriano's health status suggests that he used his letter to engage in a short literary performance or the playful act of mimicry which, as presented in chapter two, Caillois saw as a type of game (19). Leriano passes himself off as a dying man until shedding that mask and becoming the picture of perfect health when he arrives at court (92). Viewing Leriano's actions as selfish game play aligns well with Sanda Munjic's assessment of the protagonist's actions constituting a "masochistic game" (214). Nevertheless, Laureola may not have been so misguided in her belief that Leriano could die. Passing away from lovesickness may sound like exaggeration, but as we eventually see, that is precisely how Leriano does meet his end at the conclusion of the novel. Commenting on the role of love in *Cda*, César Besó Portalés specifically mentions the concept of love sickness:

Los tratados médicos medievales desarrollaron, de hecho, un conjunto de teorías variadas que explicaban el proceso psicológico, -o mejor, psicosomático- por el que una persona contraía la enfermedad del amor. Avicena, por ejemplo, consideraba que el amor no nacía como enfermedad en sí, pero podía adquirir formas morbosas cuando, no siendo satisfecho, devenía un pensamiento obsesivo; y todo ello a causa de la memoria, que reproducía constantemente el objeto amado en la mente de quien amaba. Si los impulsos de los sentidos no se satisfacían, el sujeto amador podía peligrar de muerte, puesto que alcanzar el objeto deseado se convertía en la única condición de existencia del enamorado. (6)

Given that lovesickness was not unheard of, it is possible that Laureola did genuinely believe that Leriano would die because of the love that he felt for her.

In addition to Leriano's health, Laureola may have also considered his stature in the kingdom of Macedonia before making her decision to write him. In fact, the Auctor reveals to the reader that Laureola did take Leriano's value into consideration: "díxome que le tenía escrito, pareciéndole inhumanidad perder por tan poco precio un ombre tal" (90). Laureola's high regard for Leriano may also have led her to believe his promise that her letter would represent a, "primero y postrimero galardón" (89). In other words, Laureola logically believes her lovesick correspondent's claim that all he seeks is a onetime response from her and that he wishes her no harm (89). A promise is also an important strategic move in games of cooperation, and given the fact that Laureola has been in an extended game of cooperation with the Auctor, it is not unreasonable for her to assume that Leriano is also suggesting a cooperative arrangement with his promise. Schelling indicates: "Promises are generally thought of as bilateral (contractual) commitments, given against a quid pro quo that is often a promise in return. But there is

incentive for a unilateral promise when it provides inducement to the other player to make a choice in the mutual interest” (132). Leriano’s promise suggests that like Laureola, he too is committed to a game of partial conflict, with some level of cooperation between the two. He seemingly wants to give her a way out of her uncomfortable situation and with his promise, appears to provide a win-win scenario with mutual benefit to both. He will get the letter and she will get some peace. Leriano’s promise also indicates that he is not interested in a game of total conflict which would entail inflicting as much harm as possible on Laureola. He even asks the rhetorical question, “¿Cómo avía de aprovecharme el bien que a ti te viniese mal?” (89), suggesting his concern for her safety. Taking the factors of honor, health, and stature into consideration, Laureola would need to make a decision about her response and decide whether or not to write this supposedly dying and honorable man.

Given Laureola’s interest in maintaining her honor, her “best” or most preferred option would be to send nothing and hope that Leriano ceases all contact with her. This would solve her problem with little effort on her part. Her “next best” option may be to send Leriano a message. This course of action could possibly put an end to Leriano’s advances and may help alleviate the suffering of a dying man of great importance. This option would put her honor at risk, but as long as Leriano keeps her letter a secret as requested, and sticks to his promise to cease all contact, this may be an acceptable outcome for Laureola. Her “next worst” option would be to send Leriano a letter and discover that he plans to continue his unwanted advances. This would also be dangerous to her honor, but may seem unlikely given Leriano’s reputable promise. Besides, this option is still proactive in that it is an attempt to rid herself of Leriano and may seem better than doing absolutely nothing. Her “worst” option would be to do nothing at all and

continue to endure Leriano's attempts at wooing her. This option would also be dangerous to her honor since more contact provides further opportunities for others to discover their exchanges.

While Laureola's preferences seem clear, she would ultimately need to consider Leriano's possible moves before finalizing her decision. Based on what she has seen thus far, she could safely assume that Leriano's preferred or "best" option would be to receive a message from Laureola, but continue to contact her. He has repeatedly expressed his love for her, so she must assume that his ideal situation would be sustained contact between them. Laureola can also deduce that his "next best" option would be to receive a response from Laureola and then stop all contact with her just as he has promised. According to his letter, he would still be eternally content with this option: "si en el lugar donde van las almas desesperadas ay algún bien, no pediré otro sino sentido para sentir que onraste mis huesos, por gozar aquel poco espacio de gloria tan grande" (89). His "next worst" option may be to receive nothing from Laureola but continue to contact her. This would not be ideal, but given his persistence, it seems likely that if Laureola does not respond, this would be his next course of action. He has already recruited the Auctor to help with this option more than once. Finally, Leriano's "worst" option would be to receive nothing from Laureola and cease all contact. With this option he will have gained nothing and, at least from what Leriano has stated in his letter, would surely die unhappily. In order to better understand Laureola's choices, I have included the following table which provides a visual summary of her options as well as Leriano's possible reactions to her decision.

Strategic Scenario # 4 Preferred Outcomes

Laureola's Preferred Outcomes:

1. Do nothing and hope that Leriano and the Auctor stop bothering her. (Best option value 4)
2. Send Leriano his letter and have him cease all contact. (Next best option value 3)
3. Send Leriano a letter and have him continue to contact her. (Next worst option value 2)
4. Send nothing and have Leriano continue to contact her. (Worst option value 1).

Leriano's Preferred Outcomes

1. Receive Laureola's letter and continue to contact her. (Best option value 4)
2. Receive Laureola's letter and stop all contact with her. (Next best option value 3)
3. Receive nothing from Laureola and continue to contact her. (Next worst option value 2)
4. Receive nothing from Laureola and stop all contact with her. (Worst option value 1)

After reviewing these possible scenarios, and taking into account Leriano's promise and noble stature, Laureola may feel confident that a letter from her will prompt Leriano to give up his most preferred outcome in favor of his "next best" option. After all, Leriano has indicated in writing that the "galardón" will be a onetime request (89). Furthermore, if Leriano does uphold his promise, Laureola will also benefit greatly since she will no longer need to deal with his advances. Laureola logically assumes that by writing Leriano, they are both committed to their "next best" choices with mutually satisfactory "payoff" values of 3 on the above table. It really does seem like a win-win scenario where everyone breaks even. Armed with this information, Laureola makes the logical decision to write the letter, but to her surprise, she is outmaneuvered as Leriano discards his "next best" option, as well as his implied promise, and proceeds to choose his "best" option instead. Shortly after receiving Laureola's letter, Leriano travels to the court to see the object of his desire: "Pues después que entre él y mí grandes cosas pasaron

acordó de irse a la corte” (92). Suddenly, Laureola finds Leriano kissing her hand: “Cuando besó las manos a Laureola pasaron cosas mucho de notar” (93). The fact that Leriano rushes to court to kiss Laureola’s hand indicates to the princess, and the reader, that she has decisively lost this round against Leriano. She unsuccessfully anticipated Leriano’s likely reaction to her letter. Including her three encounters with the Auctor in Strategic Scenarios #’s 1-3, this strategic exchange with Leriano constitutes her fourth loss against an opponent.

Similar to my assessment of Laureola’s interaction with the Auctor, I believe that this fourth loss for Laureola is due to her inability to recognize the type of game that she is truly playing, or perhaps worse, her inability to control the game altogether. She has, in effect, been tricked by the reassuring words of her supposedly loyal subject and restrained by fear of what that subject’s actions could do to her honor. By participating in this Courtly Love game, even if it is reluctantly, she is engaging in a high stakes, total conflict situation with Leriano, because if her actions are discovered, she herself has admitted that it would ruin her and that nobody would believe her good intentions: “porque si deste pecado fuese acusada no tengo otro testigo para salvame sino mi intención, y por ser parte tan principal no se tomaría en cuenta su dicho” (90). And yet, by choosing the option that is mutually beneficial to them both, Laureola fully believed that she was in a game of cooperation with Leriano. Like her previous encounters, Laureola chooses the most logical option for someone in a game of cooperation, but makes a terrible choice for the game of total conflict that she is truly playing with Leriano. If she is not in a game of total conflict, she is involved in something close to it because Leriano’s unwanted advances can, and nearly do, put Laureola’s life in jeopardy. Whether Leriano believes it or not, his repeated attempts at contact can, at any moment, inflict as much harm as possible if discovered, and so Laureola would be better served viewing him as a fierce opponent out to inflict maximum

damage. Once again, Laureola is either unable to recognize the type of game that others are playing around her, or she is incapable of changing the parameters of that game. Either way, San Pedro does not present her as a very proactive and forward thinking royal. For example, there are no indications that Laureola attempts to gain some ground by threatening Leriano with mutual destruction by suggesting that she could hand his letter over to the king. Certainly this option would have caused her a great deal of harm as well, but may have changed the nature of the game and given Leriano an unpalatable option to consider, even if it would mean leaving the decision yet again up to her opponent. Admittedly, Laureola is blameless in the face of Leriano's bold advances and she faces an extremely difficult and unfair situation. However, placing culpability aside, it is difficult for the reader to escape the fact that she is forced into playing Leriano's game without making any attempts at controlling it herself. Laureola is not simply a random, defenseless damsel in distress, but rather the one day queen of Macedonia as she herself indicates in her final letter to Leriano (129), and therefore should also be judged as a future monarch. If one were to apply the aforementioned metaphor of politics and chess to the depiction of Laureola, San Pedro presents her more like a pawn than a future queen, quickly outmaneuvered and not particularly powerful or feared. This fact may have been highlighted even further if a fifteenth-century reader were to compare and contrast Laureola to the potent queen of Castile who was methodically extending her power and control over the Iberian Peninsula and beyond.

Laureola's lack of power in Macedonia also reveals itself when Persio, an important noble at the king's court, falsely accuses the princess of an inappropriate relationship with Leriano. Laureola's decision to send Leriano a letter, which resulted in him shortly thereafter kissing her hand at court, directly leads to Persio's suspicions and jealous attempts at retribution.

I consider Persio's decision to lie to the king as Strategic Scenario #5. According to the Auctor's description, Persio becomes jealous after witnessing Leriano kiss the princess' hand: "Persio, hijo del señor de Gavia, miró en ellas trayendo el mismo pensamiento que Leriano traía" (93). Clearly, Persio suspects a relationship has formed between Leriano and the princess. Considering the Auctor's claim about, "sospechas celosas" (93), it is reasonable to assume that Persio is also interested in Laureola. A lawful union with the king's daughter would consolidate and fortify Persio's own power considerably, and Leriano would represent a threat to that opportunity. Furthermore, Persio's subsequent disregard for the safety and wellbeing of Laureola indicates that his jealousy stems from the perceived power that Leriano would have gained by a union with the princess, not necessarily his amorous feelings for her. This seems even more feasible if one considers the fact that there is no mention of Persio's love or affection for the princess whatsoever in the novel. Regardless of his motivations, the suspected relationship presents Persio with a simple decision about whether or not to lie to his king. Other than his own suspicions, Persio has no tangible evidence of an association between Leriano and Laureola, and yet he makes the irreversible decision to purposefully deceive his king: "apartó al rey en un secreto lugar y díxole afirmadamente que Laureola y Leriano se amavan y que se veían todas las noches después que él dormía, y que ge lo hazía saber por lo que devíe a la onra y a su servicio" (93). Given Persio's interest in Laureola, as well as the unsubstantiated lie that he tells, his actions hardly seem motivated by "onra" and "servicio" as he asserts, but instead seem sparked by, jealousy, greed, or power. Despite the Auctor's statement that Persio made the decision, "sin más deliberación ni consejo" (93), it would seem more likely that before misleading his king, Persio may very well have engaged in at least a brief strategic assessment of the scenario, taking an inventory of his own options as well as possible reactions of his monarch. After all, it is not

unreasonable to speculate that an individual may think carefully before defaming the king's daughter to his face.

Given Persio's apparent concerns about a relationship between Leriano and Laureola, he may feel that his "best" option is to accuse the princess and hope that the king believes him. This would eliminate his rival Leriano, and sentence Laureola to death. As a noble familiar with the customs of the land, Persio should know that an accusation about the king's daughter could lead to her imprisonment and execution. Although this option would not provide Persio the opportunity to join with Laureola, no one else would have the chance either, and the king would be grateful for his service. Persio may see this as a victory as well since no other rival will gain power at court through a marriage with the king's daughter. In other words, Persio is simply eliminating threats before they arise, while at the same time ingratiating himself to the king. This indicates that Persio has a total conflict mindset in which only he should be victorious. His "next best" option would be to lie to the king and discover that the king still has doubts. As a noble familiar with Macedonia's customs, Persio knows that if the king doubts his claims, he would likely call for a *Juicio de Dios*, which would require a battle between the accuser and the accused. In fact, when the king does call for a *Juicio de Dios*, the Auctor states that the king "quiso lo que devíe hazer" (93). In other words, when doubts arise, the king is obligated to order the two men to do battle. Despite the Auctor's claims that Persio was "mucho afrontado" (93), by the king's decision to order a battle, a noble with Persio's knowledge of the court should not have been surprised. The reader could even speculate that the chance to battle Leriano may be an attractive option to Persio if he believes that his martial skills are superior to his opponent's. The beginning of the text suggests that Leriano has been locked away in his self-created "*cárcel de amor*", so it may be safe to surmise that Leriano has not exactly been training for battle and may

be physically debilitated from his lovesickness. Leriano does die at the end of the novel due solely to his love and sorrow. If Persio defeats Leriano in battle that would be just as good as his “best” option, since the king would then be inclined to believe his claims. Furthermore, we see that even if the battle does go badly, Persio can always rely on his powerful family to request leniency, which is precisely what happens later in the story: “suplicaron al rey mandase echar el bastón, que ellos le fiavan para que dél hiziese justicia si claramente se hallase culpado; lo cual el rey assí les otorgó” (97). In addition to confidence in his martial skills and family connections, Persio may also consider that if he survives a defeat in the *Juicio de Dios*, he can always have friends falsely testify on his behalf. When he does lose the battle, Persio immediately requests that his friends support his false claims:

Persio, que siempre se trabajava en offender su onra por condición y en defenderla por malicia, llamó los conjurados antes que Laureola se delibrase, y díxoles que cada uno por su parte se fuese al rey y le dixese como de suyo, por quitarle de dubdas, que él acusó a Leriano con verdad, de lo cual ellos eran testigos, que le vieron hablar diversas vezes con ella en soledad; lo que ellos hizieron de la manera que él ge lo dixo, y tal forma supieron darse y assí afirmaron su testimonio que turbaron al rey. (101)

With confidence in his martial skills, the ability of his family to intervene in the battle, and the loyalty of his friends to support his claims, Persio’s “next best” choice, which included accusing Leriano but being doubted by the king, may seem just as good as his “best” option. Of course, Persio could also decide to choose his “next worst” option and not accuse the two suspected lovers, and hope that the king discovers a relationship on his own. Persio has no real evidence that a relationship exists between Leriano and Laureola, so he may have considered keeping quiet. However, he can’t just count on the king randomly discovering a connection between

Leriano and his daughter. In other words, Persio can't leave things up to chance; this is a competitive situation after all. Finally, his "worst" option would be to do nothing and find that the king never intervenes. This would mean that Leriano and Laureola are free to develop a relationship. This could even lead to a union between the two or at least favoritism from the future queen toward Leriano. In fact, Laureola does offer future honors and benefits to Leriano in her final letter to him (129).

Persio's options are clear and he is well positioned for success, because it appears that whether or not the king believes him, he should accuse Leriano and Laureola if wants a chance at eliminating Leriano as a competitor. Still, Persio may have briefly considered the king's possible reactions, even if he doesn't mind whether or not the king has doubts. The king clearly has no good options in this scenario. It would be logical to assume that the king would want to know if something were going on between Leriano and the princess. Even if only rumors existed about a secret relationship, the king would likely want to know about the activities at his court, especially if his daughter were involved. Therefore, his "best" option would be to hear the accusations, but not believe them. Not believing the accusation would either involve disproving the accusations completely through evidence, or allowing a *Juicio de Dios* to decide the fate of the accuser. His "next best" option would be to hear Persio's claims and believe him based on evidence. While believing the claims may cause him personal grief, he would discover the supposed loyalty of Persio and the disloyalty of Leriano. Knowing which nobles to trust would certainly be a priority for any king. His "next worst" option would be to hear nothing and discover a relationship on his own. This would indicate that his daughter and Leriano were disloyal to him, and that nobody else at court informed him of the situation. Finally, his "worst"

outcome would be to hear nothing and never discover a thing. This would position him as a weak and uninformed king who does not control his court.

The choices available to Persio, along with the king's possible preferences can be visually represented in the following table.

Strategic Scenario # 5 List of Preferred Outcomes

Persio's Preferred Outcomes

1. Make accusation against Leriano. Hope the king believes him. (Best option value 4)
2. Make accusation against Leriano. Discover that the king does not believe him. (Next best option value 3)
3. Make no accusation against Leriano. Hope that the king also suspects an inappropriate relationship exists (Next worst option value 2)
4. Make no accusation. Lose favor with the king. (Worst option value 1)

The King's Preferred Outcomes

1. Hear the accusation but not believe it. (Best option value 4)
2. Hear the accusation and believe it. (Next best option value 3)
3. Not hear the accusation but still believe it. (Next worst option value 2)
4. Not hear the accusation and not believe it. (Worst option value 1)

Reviewing the list of possible scenarios and outcomes, Persio can logically proceed with an accusation. Making the accusation is both his "best" and "next best" strategies, and he could theorize that hearing the accusation is also the king's preferred options as well. Despite the

Auctor's original claim that Persio made the accusation "sin más deliberación ni consejo" (93), the fact is that Persio's accusation would appear to be quite logical and strategically sound.

Persio proceeds with his plan and after making his false claims, the king is initially inclined to believe him: "Turbado el rey de cosa tal, estovo dubdoso y pensativo sin luego determinarse a responder, y después que mucho dormió sobre ello, tóvolo por verdad, creyendo, segund la virtud y auctoridad de Persio que no le diría otra cosa" (93). Viewing the interaction between Persio and the king in terms of a game, Persio's first move would appear to signal to the king that they are in fact entering into a game of cooperation, with the mutual goal of preserving the king's honor. Still, the king's "best" option is to discredit any accusation, and so despite his personal belief that Persio's claim may be true, he calls for a *Juicio de Dios*: "mandó llamar a Persio y díxole que acusase de traición a Leriano segund sus leyes" (93). Of course, this action would appear to be the standard legal avenue for such claims and does not necessarily indicate any mistrust toward Persio. Once Persio and Leriano exchange letters, the king arranges the battle:

sabiendo el rey que estavan concertados en la batalla aseguró el campo, y señalado el lugar donde hiziesen y ordenadas todas las cosas que en tal auto se requerían, según las ordenanças de Macedonia, puesto el rey en un cadahalso, vinieron los cavalleros cada uno acompañado y favorecido como merecía. Y guardadas en igualdad las onras dentram[b]os, entraron en el campo; y como los fieles los dexaron solos, fuéronse el uno para el otro. (96)

As previously indicated, just as Leriano is about to win the battle, Persio's family intervenes on his behalf (97). Despite the king's apparent leniency with Persio, he still does not rush to make a

hasty decision about the veracity of his claims. In other words, he has not yet finalized his response to Persio's initial move. This speaks well of the king since he is not willing to commit to any move until he absolutely must do so, thus demonstrating that he is not so quickly drawn into games that others initiate. This fact is further demonstrated by the king's response to Leriano after his decision to halt the *Juicio de Dios*: "Atento estuvo el rey a todo lo que Leriano quiso dezir, y acabada su habla respondióle que él avría su consejo sobre lo que deviese hazer, que en cosa tal con deliberación se avie de dar la sentencia" (100).

In order for Persio to force the king's hand, and thus ensure his preferred outcome is still a viable option, he relies on his last line of defense, which is the successful organization of a cover up with the help of his friends. Persio still wants the king to believe that they are both in a cooperative situation, even though Persio has engaged in a game of total conflict since his lies and dishonesty put him directly at odds with the king's wellbeing. In fact, Schelling indicates that covering up the truth is a sure sign that someone is involved in a zero sum game: "Hardly anything captures the spirit of the zero sum game quite so much as the importance of "not being found out" and of employing a mode of decision that is proof against deductive anticipation by the other player" (160). Persio's actions indicate that he also knows the importance of "not being found out" while in the midst of a game. Persio's reliance on his friends' false testimony is similar to Schelling's strategic tactic known as "delegation", which he describes by stating, "Another "move" that is sometimes available is the delegation of part or all of one's interest, or part or all of one's initiative for decision, to some agent who becomes (or perhaps already is) another player in the game" (142). By adding additional players that appear to be cooperating with the king, Persio successfully convinces his monarch that he is telling the truth. After speaking with the false witnesses, the king sentences Laureola to death: "Pues queriendo el rey

que pagase la inocencia de Laureola por la traición de los falsos testigos, acordó que fuese sentenciada por justicia” (101). Though Persio nearly exhausted every option available to him, his final strategic move of adding additional players to the game convinces the king that Persio is telling the truth. In other words, Persio has outmaneuvered and out-strategized the king in this particular exchange. Like his daughter, the king is forced to believe that he is in a game of cooperation when he is truly participating in a game of total conflict. While the king has more resources at his disposal than his daughter, even he is unable to recognize the true games being played at his court.

The king’s verdict puts Leriano on track to make the largest strategic decision of his life; the assault on the king’s castle to free Laureola. This episode constitutes Strategic Scenario # 6. Once the king sentences his daughter to death, the Auctor explains that Leriano “estovo en poco de perder el seso, y con un arrebatamiento y passion desesperada acordava de ir a la corte a librar a Laureola y matar a Persio o perder por ello la vida” (101). Leriano makes the decision instantaneously, with no thought or planning. He openly commits to a zero sum, total conflict scenario with the king, evidenced by his self-imposed options of success or death.

However, the Auctor is not quite as brash as Leriano and urges him to approach Laureola’s rescue more strategically. The Auctor explains: “Y viendo yo ser aquel consejo más peligro que esperança, puesto con él en razón desviélo dél. Y como estava con la aceleración desacordado, quiso servirse de mi parecer en lo que oviese de delibrar, el cual me plogo dalle porque no dispusiese con alteración para que se arrepintiese con pesar” (101-102). The Auctor is truly thinking strategically and advises his friend to make a plan before acting. Perhaps the Auctor’s inclination toward strategy is attributable to his military service in the “guerra” one year earlier (65). He certainly sounds like a military strategist when advising his friend to consider all

possible consequences of his proposed attack: “Siempre lo dubdoso se ha de tomar lo más seguro, y, si te pones en matar a Persio y librar a Laureola, debes antes ver si es cosa con que podrás salir; que como es de más estima de onra della que la vida tuya, si no pudieses acabarlo dexarías a ella condenada y a tí desonrado” (102). The Auctor also makes a list of the preferred strategies that would be beneficial to Leriano, as well as the order in which they should be tested.

The Auctor states:

Lo que antes conviene es esto: yo iré a la corte y juntaré con el cardinal de Gausa todos los cavalleros y perlados que aí se hallaren, el cual con voluntad alegre suplicará al rey le otorgue a Laureola la vida. Y si en esto no hallare remedio, suplicaré a la reina que con todas las onestas y principales mugeres de su casa y cibdad le pida la libertad de su hija, a cuyas lágrimas y petición no podrá, a mi creer, negar piedad. Y si aquí no hallo esperança, dire a Laureola que le escriba certificándole su inocencia. Y cuando todas estas cosas me fueren contrarias, proferirm’he al rey que darás una persona tuya que haga armas con los tres malvados testigos. Y no aprovechando nada desto, probarás la fuerça, en la que por ventura hallarás la piedad que en el rey yo buscava. (103)

The Auctor offers a thorough list of options and strategies for Leriano to consider. Furthermore, if one views this situation through a ludic lens, the Auctor’s suggestion to include others who have a stake in the outcome of events implies that Leriano should change his situation into a game of partial conflict, or a non-zero sum game, thus allowing other factors to permeate the equation. Only if all else fails does the Auctor suggest taking an all or nothing, zero sum approach to Laureola’s rescue. Additionally, even with a physical attack, the Auctor urges Leriano to plan ahead for this eventuality. What will he do with Laureola once he has rescued her? The Auctor has a plan for this as well. He states:

Estemos agora en que ya as forçado la prisión y sacado della a Laureola. Si la traes a tu tierra, es condenada de culpa; dondequiera que allá la dexes no la librarás de pena. Cata aquí mayor mal que el primero. Paréceme a mí para sanear esto, obrando tú esto otro, que se deve tener tal forma: yo llegaré de tu parte a Galio, hermano de la reina, que en parte desea tanto la libertad de la presa como tú mismo, y le diré lo que tienes acordado, y le suplicaré, porque sea salva del cargo y de la vida, que esté para el día que fueres con alguna gente, para que si fuere tal tu ventura que la puedas sacar, en sacándola la pongas en su poder a vista de todo el mundo, en testimonio de su bondad y tu limpieza. (103)

The Auctor's plan is admirable due its variety of detail and foresight. He has quite literally thought of every eventuality. It is clear from this extensive and well thought out proposal that the Auctor is no stranger to strategic planning. In fact, the Auctor's speech aligns quite well with Schelling's concept of "strategic moves" (160) which includes "delegation" (Schelling 142) and "mediation" (Schelling 143) as two possible options available to players in games of partial conflict. The Auctor suggests that by "delegating" responsibility to him, Leriano will have a better chance for success. Likewise, the Auctor explains that he will then promote the idea of "mediation" by recruiting the help of others at court to intervene on Leriano's behalf. Schelling provides observations about the importance of mediation:

The role of the mediator is another element for analysis in game theory. A mediator, whether imposed on the game by its original rules or adopted by the players to facilitate an efficient outcome, is probably best viewed as an element in the communication arrangements or as a third player with a payoff structure of his own who is given an influential role through his control over communication. (144)

This very same strategic mindset was also present in the Auctor's first encounter with Laureola when the Auctor worked as both a delegate and mediator for Leriano. Now, the Auctor has Laureola, the cardinal, and the reina all acting as delegates and mediators on Leriano's behalf. Each in turn, pleads their case before the king, who is unshaken in his decision to sentence Laureola to death based on the false accusations made by Persio's friends. Interestingly, in a similar spirit to the idea of Game Theory and strategic thinking, the cardinal urges the king to consider each of his options along with their consequences:

Señor, las cosas obradas con deliberación y acuerdo procuran provecho y alabanza para quien las haze, y las que con saña se hacen con ar[r]epentimiento se piensan. Los sabios como tú, cuando obran, primero deliberan que disponen y sonles presentes todas las cosas que pueden venir, así de lo que esperan provecho como de lo que temen revés...El pensamiento del sabio, agora acuerde, agora mande, agora ordene, nunca se parta de lo que puede acaecer, y siempre como zeloso de su fama se guarda de error. (109)

Unfortunately, all of the Auctor's aforementioned strategies do not work. The king is not persuaded by the cardinal, the queen, Laureola, or the Auctor. He has made his decision and decides to follow through with it unless further evidence emerges. All of Leriano's original "preferred outcomes" of a peaceful resolution have not come to pass. This is really when Leriano must make his strategic decision about whether to attack the court and rescue Laureola by force. The Auctor has already arranged for Laureola's uncle to meet him at court to keep Laureola under his protection, so the idea of further damage to Laureola's honor has been removed from the equation and is one less factor to consider. The only thing Leriano really needs to decide is whether or not to physically attack the court.

Considering that the Auctor and Leriano have asked nearly everyone of importance at court to try and persuade the king to change his mind, we can say that his “best” option would be to rescue Laureola by non-violent means and suffer no retaliation. His “next best” option may be to rescue Laureola by non-violent means, but somehow still face punishment from the king. This option would imply that the king has changed his mind about killing Laureola, but still holds Leriano to be guilty of some crime. This is not optimal, but would most likely be acceptable to Leriano, at least in the short run until he can find a way to vindicate himself. Of course, the fact that Leriano is considering an attack on the court means that his “best” and “next best” options must be discarded. His “next worst” option would be to rescue Laureola by force and suffer no retaliation by the king. While this seems like it should be an acceptable option, in reality this would mean that he has taken the irreversible decision to attack his monarch. He would lose all rights at court and his honor may be in question. However, Leriano would seem to be able to justify this when he states to the king: “Cata que guardando las leyes se conservan los naturales” (99-100). In a footnote to his edition of the work, José Francisco Ruiz Casanova points out that “Al no «guardar las leyes» el rey, según el parecer de Leriano, éste dejará de sentirse vasallo de aquél, lo que justifica el posterior enfrentamiento armado” (100). Leriano’s “worst” option would be to rescue Laureola, but face the king in a large scale attack.

Before making a final decision, Leriano may have considered the king’s preferences and most likely moves if faced with a possible rescue attempt of Laureola. The reader can assume that the king would not want his sentence challenged without the introduction of some new evidence in Laureola’s favor, and that he will do whatever it takes to ensure the continuity of his authority. The king’s “best” option is for no physical rescue attempt to be made and have no need to physically retaliate. This option upholds his sentence with little effort on his part.

Knowing this is the king's preferred option may be why the Auctor suggests first sending in the cardinal and the queen to peacefully beg for Laureola's life. It is a non-physical attempt to rescue Laureola and there is no real need for the king to retaliate. The king's "next best" option would be to see no physical rescue attempt, but still punish those that question his decision. Though not likely to punish someone who does not attempt an armed rebellion, the Auctor does describe the king's temper when he states: "Respondióme que me dexase de embaxadas de Leriano, que en oír su nombre le crecía la pasión" (113). One can assume that the king would rather deal with an annoying messenger harshly than have to endure a physical attack against his court. His "next worst" option would be to have someone such as Leriano attack his court in order to rescue Laureola. In this situation he would retaliate and need to engage in full scale battle just to uphold the law in his land. This is precisely what transpires, but for now these are only possible options that Leriano may have considered. His "worst" option would be to suffer an attack on his court, but do nothing at all. This would position him as a weak king who is unable to enforce his own laws and decisions. The list of Leriano's preferred outcomes, along with what he could safely assume about the king's preferences are visually represented in the following table:

Strategic Scenario # 6 Preferred Outcomes

Leriano's Preferred Outcomes:

1. Not attack the court. Rescue Laureola by some non-physical means and suffer no retaliation from the king. (Best option value 4)
2. Not attack the court. Rescue Laureola by some non-physical means and suffer some type of retaliation from the king. (Next best option value 3)

3. Rescue Laureola by force and suffer no retaliation from the king. (Next worst option value 2)
4. Rescue Laureola by force and suffer some type of retaliation by the king. (Worst option value 1)

The King's Preferred Outcomes

1. No physical rescue and no need to retaliate. (Best option value 4)
2. No physical rescue but retaliate or deal harshly with those that question his authority (Next best option value 3)
3. Experience a physical rescue attempt and retaliate militarily. (Next worst option value 2)
4. Experience a physical rescue attempt and avoid retaliation. (Worst option value 1)

Looking over these lists of preferred options, Leriano would clearly be able to see that he has already tried his “best” and “next best” options of a non-violent rescue without success. This means that his “worst” and “next worst” options, which involve a physical attack on the king’s court to rescue Laureola, are really the only course of action left available to him. Leriano would also know that with a physical rescue attempt, he will force the king into choosing between his own “next worst” and “worst” options, proving that both men are engaging in activities they would prefer to avoid. Leriano could also deduce that if attacked, the king would choose his “next worst” option and retaliate with force. This will mean that Leriano has ended up with his worst possible outcome with a payoff value of 1 on the above table, while his king will come out slightly ahead by receiving a payout value of 2. This would mean that the king will have a slight advantage in this round. Of course, for Leriano there is still additional value in his “worst” scenario because Laureola will most likely have been rescued.

Knowing that he will be faced with the worst possible outcome, Leriano still decides to attack the court. He can safely assume that the king will respond with force since it will be his preferred option in the event of a physical rescue attempt. Although the attack itself is not very strategically sound in its entirety, Leriano makes the intelligent decision to gather his men for a sustained attack and defense:

juntó sus cavalleros y díxoles cuánto eran más obligados los buenos a temer la vergüença que el peligro. Allí les acordó cómo por las obras que hizieron aún bibía la fama de los pasados; rogóles que por cobdicia de la Gloria de buenos no curasen de la de bivos; tráxoles a la memoria el premio de bien morir y mostróles cuánto era locura temello no pudiendo escusallo. Prometióles muchas mercedes, y después que les hizo un largo razonamiento, díxoles para qué los avía llamado, los cuales a una boz juntos se profirieron a morir con él. (119-120)

Leriano must suspect that the king's forces will eventually prevail, but he has clearly decided that rescuing Laureola will count as a victory as well: "llegó hasta donde estava Laureola, a la cual sacó con tanto acatamiento y cerimonia como en tiempo seguro lo pudiera hazer; y puesta la rodilla en el suelo, besóle las manos como a hija de su rey" (121). This somewhat logical decision may indicate the true danger posed by games played by young noblemen. Mainly, that those men will make what appear to be logical and rational choices which ultimately go against their own best interests and the wellbeing of their monarch as well. In this case, Leriano is forced into a situation in which rational, though not ideal, decisions are all that remain available to him. Perhaps not surprisingly, the king retaliates immediately: "como ya ell alboroto llegó a oídos del rey pidió las armas, y, tocadas las trompetas y atabales, armóse toda la gente cortesana de la

cibdad” (121). The king quickly chases Leriano back to Susa where he sets up a siege against Leriano’s stronghold.

After suffering heavy casualties, Leriano eventually captures one of the false witnesses, who admits the truth and the king quickly lifts the siege and returns to his court. Despite the apparent resolution, Laureola is still unwilling to correspond to Leriano as he would like, and heart-broken, dies after drinking the torn pieces of her letters. Before his final act of drinking Laureola’s words, he enumerates the positive effects and influences that women have on men. While Leriano’s speech gives important insight into his thoughts and feelings about women, it is also noteworthy that this action lacks the game-like, strategic decision-making elements of the rest of the novel. Leriano’s speech is made when he is no longer “playing” any games. In fact, one could say that Leriano, much like Ardanlyer in *Sla* and Grimalte in *GyG*, has chosen to exit the Game of Courtly Love permanently. Leriano’s speech appears to have no more strategizing or artifice, but instead, it is an attempt to transmit the knowledge that he has gained about women through the various games inspired by Courtly Love that he has played throughout his life.

The current chapter has explored the strategic interaction of characters in Diego de San Pedro’s *Cda*. Game Theory has shown that these interactions can be seen as high stakes games which often require the “winners” to engage in strategic reasoning. Most characters in the novel act in logical and rational ways to obtain or maintain their power. The exception, of course, is Leriano’s semi-rational choice to attack the king based on his love for Laureola, though even he logically exhausted all other options first with the help of the Auctor. Despite the rational approach of most characters in the novel, there still exists what Gerli described as a “problematic of reference in the sentimental romances” (“Señora” 243). The analysis has shown that much of the ambiguities found throughout the text stem from characters playing the wrong games or

being forced into games beyond their knowledge or control. Leriano and Persio abandon their duty to their king and engage in game-like activities to further their own personal desires and goals. Furthermore, due to existing codes of courtly conduct, both King Gaulo and his daughter Laureola are tricked into believing that they are playing games of cooperation with their most trusted noblemen. Both members of the royal family seem incapable of recognizing that they are actually in the middle of total conflict, zero sum games, and tend to show lack of strategic foresight. If the novel does have a political message, as many scholars have indicated, that message may very well be a warning that monarchs need to be especially mindful of Games of Courtly Love being played in their kingdom. In the case of Laureola and her father, their inability to see the true games being played all around them posed a danger to their personal honor and had far reaching consequences in the kingdom by putting the heir to the throne in jeopardy, while simultaneously forcing the king to engage in military action. For Leriano, all of his game playing has resulted in his own death, once again showing the dangers of excessive play.

In contrast to the other works studied in this thesis, *Cda*'s game-playing is much more developed. Unlike the explicit ludic literary techniques used by Rodríguez del Padrón or the overt ludic challenge created by Flores, Diego de San Pedro presents a more focused and in-depth look at how the interactions between nobles can be viewed as a complex game with far reaching consequences. While *Estoria de dos amadores* in *Sla* certainly had elements of strategic game-like thinking, one may recall that Ardnalyer and his father were almost exclusively engaged in a total conflict, zero sum game. In *Cda*, the combination of total and partial conflict games with intertwined and hidden interests of the characters highlights a more nuanced reality of late fifteenth-century court life. Unlike King Gaulo and Laureola, neither Ardanlyer nor his

father was ever confused about the type of winner takes all game that he was playing. If *Sla* and *GyG* were warnings for readers to be careful about the dangers of excessive ludic activity at court, *Cda* takes this lesson a step further by showing just how easily one can lose track of which games are being played by whom, and just what type of risk that can pose for a kingdom. Building on Folger's concept of a "parasitic" self-constitution (*Escape* 18) forming within Courtly Love, I proposed in the introduction to this chapter that Courtly Love in *Cda* may also be the site of a ludic self-construction for individuals who see the world in terms of the social games that should or should not be played at court, and who know which strategies are needed for success in such an environment. As a counter to all of the strategic and subtle courtly game-playing found in *Cda*, the following chapter will focus on the more overt, physical manifestations of play and games found in *AdG*.

CHAPTER FOUR: PERFORMANCE AND PLAY IN *AMADÍS DE GAULA*

The previous three chapters explored the presence and impact of the play/conflict relationship in three *novelas sentimentales* produced on the fifteenth-century Iberian Peninsula. In each text studied thus far, play has manifested itself in a variety of formats to create or highlight situations of conflict, materializing as allegory and poetry in one moment only to reemerge pages later at the heart of competition, strategy, and ritual. Perhaps due to its abundance of possible forms, play is, as Mihai Spariosu states: “as elusive as it was two thousand years ago” (“Literature” k1). However, despite its “elusiveness”, play has repeatedly surfaced throughout my analyses of the *novela sentimental* and has revealed itself on several occasions in the form of performance. While I have only briefly touched upon these performative moments in previous chapters, each example encountered thus far has occurred in the midst of intense conflict, all within the ludic framework of Courtly Love games. Recognizing the inherent link between performance and play, the current chapter explores the ludic origins of conflictive knightly performance in *AdG*.⁶¹

My analysis views conflictive knightly activity in *AdG* as a series of performances with play at their very core. I propose that performances in *AdG* find inspiration in, and can therefore

⁶¹ All references to the text will rely upon Juan Manuel Cacho Blecua’s edition of *AdG*, written by Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo. Cacho Blecua’s edition is based on the 1508 edition published in the city of Zaragoza. After its initial publication, the text was reprinted between the years 1511 and 1586 (Sieber 204).

be classified under, three distinct “play categories”, which I have identified throughout the text. These categories include: “secretive play,” “competitive play,” and “deep play” (a term borrowed from Diane Ackerman).⁶² In this chapter, I will establish the definitions and parameters of each play grouping using a variety of play theories and then assign key moments of chivalric conflictive performance found within *AdG* to one of these three divisions. Tracing the playful roots of combative performances in *AdG* will help to situate this chivalric work alongside the *novela sentimental* as yet another incarnation of a ludic text, thus allowing both subgenres to be incorporated into a larger categorization which I term “ficción lúdica” produced on the fifteenth-century Iberian Peninsula.⁶³ While the majority of play and games in the *novelas sentimentales* ultimately leads to death and destruction for the protagonists, there is a marked difference in this Chivalric work. The analysis will reveal that despite the dangers involved with ludic inspired combative behavior of knights, the characters ultimately rise above these challenges and ultimately enjoy success by the end of the narrative, presenting us with a very different vision of play-inspired behavior than what was seen in the previously analyzed Sentimental texts. While dangerous, ludic activity, especially when it involves physical strength and prowess with a blade, can also pay off quite nicely for those with the right skills and abilities. With a cast of characters frequently carrying out and observing knightly deeds, *AdG* is an ideal text to explore the play/chivalric performance paradigm.

The plot of *AdG* begins with Amadís secretly conceived by King Perión and princess Elisena. Hoping to avoid punishment, Elisena gives birth in secret and places her child in the

⁶² I develop this last category relying on the theory of “Deep Play” developed by Diane Ackerman in her work *Deep Play*. In that book she builds on the concept of “Deep Play” presented by Jeremy Bentham in the nineteenth-century.

⁶³ Despite *AdG*’s early sixteenth-century publication date, Martín de Riquer posits that the work was written in the late fifteenth-century, stating that “Montalvo, que consta como muerto en 1505, parece que trabajaba en *Amadís de Gaula* hacia 1492” (8).

river along with Perión's ring and sword. Amadís is found and raised by a knight until going to live with King Languines. While there, Amadís meets and falls in love with Oriana, daughter of King Lisuarte. After being knighted by his unknown father King Perión, Amadís sets out on a series of adventures where he will make his way to the court of King Lisuarte and reunite with Oriana, eventually marrying her in secret. During his quests, he will save his father's kingdom, discover his true identity, meet his unknown brothers Galaor and Florestán, fall out of favor with King Lisuarte, and become ruler of the Ínsola Firme. Furthermore, Amadís will undergo several name changes including Beltenebros, Caballero de la Sierpe, El Caballero de la Verde Spada, and El Caballero Griego. Under the latter two names, Amadís travels to the east, eventually reaching Constantinople before returning home to his Ínsola Firme. Not knowing about the union between Amadís and Oriana, King Lisuarte arranges a marriage between his daughter and the emperor of Rome. This prompts Amadís to launch a successful rescue attempt as Oriana is en route to Rome, thus angering his father-in-law. The conclusion of the text pits Amadís against Oriana's father in a large scale battle, but eventually their marriage and son, Esplandián, are publicly recognized and accepted, and a peaceful resolution is reached. All of these events in the text unfold with the help of a narrator who claims to have found and added to the story, all while adding sage commentary on the characters' actions and decisions.

As Juan Bautista Avalle-Arce confirms, this 1508 version of events "very likely, is not the *editio princeps*" (1) of the work, and there existed what he has termed a "primitive version" (2) of the narrative.⁶⁴ Additionally, Lilia E. F. de Orduna points out that the story can trace its roots back even further than the fifteenth-century stating: "hay testimonios de los escritores de

⁶⁴ According to Avalle-Arce, "The primitive text was divided into three books. The one we know is divided into four. Some statements by Montalvo lead us to suspect that Esplandián, the son of Amadís, did not appear in the primitive version, and, therefore, Esplandián, his feats, and the fourth book of *Amadís* were the exclusive creation of Montalvo" (2).

los siglos XIV y XV que lo leyeron con entusiasmo” (25). In contrast to Montalvo’s version, it is believed that some of the earlier versions presented a more tragic ending to the story with Amadís killed by his unknown son Esplandián, and his wife Oriana committing suicide when overcome with grief (Avalle-Arce 10). This would place the “primitive version” mentioned by Avalle-Arce in closer alignment with the outcomes and overall messages of the *novelas sentimentales* presented throughout this dissertation. In other words, the excessive ludic activity of knights appeared to produce a final result of tragedy and suffering. This would more easily coincide with my suggestion that the Sentimental texts analyzed thus far were a warning against excessive game play among nobles.

While Montalvo would appear to have changed the outcome of events, what appears to remain consistent would be the intense and competitive knightly performances of Amadís and his men. As the recent plot summary indicates, *AdG* is replete with public displays of chivalric activity. In fact, in his article entitled, “Tipología de los personajes en el *Amadís*”, Elroy R. González asserts: “En el *Amadís*, los sucesos, la acción misma, son la manifestación del personaje. La acción lo es todo...Las acciones individuales serán la forma de medir a los personajes, y no existe el desarrollo de un personaje marginado de los acontecimientos: el personaje es sus obras” (843). As González asserts, characters in *AdG* define themselves almost exclusively by their physical actions. In most cases, these actions manifest themselves throughout *AdG* as public displays of chivalric performance.

While the concept of performance is not easily defined, narrowly focusing on knightly behavior in a chivalric context should allow for a more manageable definition of performance for the purposes of analyzing *AdG*. Performance theorist Marvin Carlson has observed certain characteristics of performance such as “the public demonstration of particular skills” (3) and,

“culturally coded pattern of behavior” (4), which I would suggest are easily applicable to the activities of knights, who are culturally bound to enact certain behaviors while simultaneously expected to demonstrate their superiority in battle and love. In her study of masculinity in Arthurian Romances, Jennifer Delong defines the knight as combining “performance, behavioral codes and social rank with an idealism of purpose” (379). Likewise, in her study of masculinity in medieval Iberian texts, Emily S. Beck also presents physical demonstration of skills as typical of the nobility: “idealized nobility ultimately justifies its superior social position through violent military exploits and by demonstrable prowess in feats of arms” (1). Both Delong and Beck would appear to indicate that knightly behavior had a specific purpose of upholding the *status quo* in terms of power and social expectations, and that chivalric activity was most effective when viewed and contemplated by an audience. In other words, acts of chivalry had a certain performative quality to them.

Of course, public performance was not limited to battle alone, and nobility could be seen performing in other venue as well, such as the royal court. As Jaeger points out in his discussion of courtliness: “It is a commonplace of court life that all faces viewed in open encounter are masks...The first rule of survival is that the courtier composes a mask, a surrogate character” (239). Likewise, Susan Crane states that medieval courtiers were accustomed to being “on display, subject to the judgment of others, and continually reinvented in performance” (4). Similarly, José Manuel Nieto Soria observes Iberian nobility’s propensity for performance by claiming: “En efecto...parece estar presente entre los monarcas de la dinastía Trastámara...una evidente conciencia de la utilidad política de la frecuente exhibición pública y multitudinaria de su posición dirigente a través de la puesta en práctica de determinados recursos ceremoniales” (46). Nieto Soria’s assertion would seem to describe Isabel de Castilla quite well considering the

fact that she relied on such “recursos ceremoniales” and “exhibición pública” (Nieto Soria 46) during the course of her reign. Ian Michael points out that “Queen Isabel led the dancing with one of her ladies-in-waiting at Aranjuez, when she received on her absent husband’s behalf the Collar of the Toison d’Or from the King of the Romans’s emissary” (109). This is just one example which clearly demonstrates that Doña Isabel certainly knew how to mix performance and politics.

In addition to publicly performing for foreign dignitaries, Isabel also appears to have relied upon performance for entertainment as well. In his presentation of Isabel’s likely interest in Chivalric Romance, Ian Michael elaborates on the queen’s interest in performance as entertainment:

Isabel’s chief entertainments (apart from allegedly embroidering a banner to be hoisted above the Alhambra and a chasuble) seem to have been dancing and singing: as well as taking part in family masques, she performed a dance before Enrique IV at Segovia during the New Year’s Eve celebrations of 1474, when she was reconciled to him, and a few days later Fernando performed a similar solo dance...It seems probable that her court was generally less pious than it was popularly portrayed. (109)

Michael would appear to be describing two monarchs with a propensity for public performance. Michael goes on to suggest that the monarchs often acted like characters from a Chivalric text: “What is most striking is that Isabel and Fernando, like the other monarchs of the period, seem always to have behaved as though they were characters out of chivalric romances” (109).⁶⁵

Michael draws even stronger connections between books of chivalry, the Catholic Monarchs, and

⁶⁵ In fact, Chivalric Romances were quite popular. As Jennifer G. Wollock points out: “The series of Spanish romances beginning around 1345 with the first book of *Amadís de Gaula*, which carried the prose romance into the sixteenth century, sparked a huge craze across Europe” (131).

performance by suggesting that Isabel and Fernando were acting out in real life the chivalric material that they read in their books and viewed in their tapestries: “Like the lives of their Trastámaran predecessors and their Burgundian and Hapsburg successors, the lives Isabel and Fernando led were the books they read-and the tapestries they viewed- in which they splendidly acted out the roles that the literary chivalric code assigned to them” (110).⁶⁶ Michael’s use of the words “acted out the roles,” would seem to present both Isabel and Fernando as actors performing their parts assigned to them by the world of literary chivalry. Michael strengthens the ties between the Catholic Monarchs’ activities and Chivalric Romances even further by highlighting the link between Fernando, Isabel, and Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo: “Isabel’s husband was said to be a fervent admirer of *Amadís*, while Montalvo, the author of the four-book version of *Amadís*, fervently admired the Catholic Monarchs” (110). The connection between chivalric performance, *AdG*, and the court of Isabel and Fernando would appear to be strong, if not mutually influenced.

Based on Michael’s observations, finding theatrical tendencies within the pages of *AdG* does not seem out of place if the Catholic Monarchs themselves were inspired to perform based on such material. In fact, other chivalric works produced outside of the Iberian Peninsula also contain a certain theatrical nature to them. In her article, “Theatricality of the Chivalric World in Thomas Malory’s *Le Morte D’arthur*,” Joanna Bukowska relies on the theories of Goffman and others to highlight the theatrical nature of the knights’ behavior in the English Romance of Chivalry:

⁶⁶ In her article, “The Knight, the Kings, and the Tapestry: The Amadís Series”, Simone Pinet raises the question of whether Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo may have viewed “Amadisian” themed tapestries at the court of Isabel de Castilla and whether those tapestries had any influence on his literary creation (549).

What I mean, thus by theatricality in *Le Morte D'arthur* is not the dramatic immediacy dependant on the position of the narrator...but the abundance in Malory's work of ceremonious forms of knightly interaction, whose formalization and social implications create the effect of public spectacle, in which the chivalric ideals are enacted. The dramatic effect is created by the ritualisation of these traditional forms of behavior, which may also be described as performative, since they are sustained in public to achieve a specific effect, namely to increase a knight's worship and reputation. (34)

Whether in a text like *AdG*, or in *Le Morte d'arthur*, knightly activity clearly has a performative quality when "chivalric ideals are enacted" (Bukowska 34), thus creating a, "public spectacle" (Bukowska 34). In the same way that Bukowska sees theatricality in the, "public spectacle" of the "ceremonious forms of knightly interactions" (34), the current chapter also views knightly activity as performance, with play at its very core. Despite the ludic quality of knightly performance, it will be important to remember that the knights' actions are ultimately, as Bukowska indicates, to increase a knight's "worship and reputation" (34). In other words, knights engage in public performance to increase their self-worth, influence, and power, and Amadís and his companions are no different.

Despite the self-serving nature of much of the conflictive performances in *AdG*, I assert that the majority of such actions can trace their roots to the play concept. The connection between performance and play should not be surprising considering that many modern-day performance theorists readily recognize the role that play has in a performance. Henry Bial states: "But all performances, even rituals, contain some element of play, some space for variation" (135), and Richard Schechner contends that "art and ritual, especially performance, is the homeground of playing. This is because the process of making performances does not so

much imitate playing as epitomize it” (“Playing”16). Likewise, Goffman also views human interaction as a type of performance best understood through the concepts of play and games.

According to Ducharme and Fine:

Goffman sees games as mechanisms for the display and re-creation of character. They are not insignificant arenas of interaction; rather, they are most important, for they permit the dramatization of the self. He makes it quite clear that interaction games are to be taken seriously, since they demand that character be brought into play. (107)

The notion that an individual can present a “character” to observers also resonates with Roger Caillouis’ game category of mimicry in which an individual “temporarily sheds his personality in order to feign another” (19). This mimetic quality to play has also been noted by Michael J. C. Echeruo in his discussion of African festivals:

All play (*egwu*) involves a doing (mimesis) and a celebrating (dianoia). The doing is the factor of agency and even of agonism. The celebrating is its signification. To do or act is, in retrospect, always to do again, never for the first time. In doing so, or in repeating an action, we enact that action. We do it again. That is imitation, so to speak. In play, that repetition is not primary agency. Even when an acted act (as in a parade) produces a similar result, as in its aboriginal doing, that result is itself a *re*-doing, or a re-showing of agency, and so a playing, hence at the very least a representation. This is basic, rudimentary, or even minimal mimesis. (151-152)

Echeruo’s assertion that play ultimately involves mimetic activity which is usually a “repetition” of some previous activity also brings to mind Schechner’s concept of “restored behavior” which is an integral part of his definition of performance. Describing Schechner’s concept of “restored

behavior”, Marvin Carlson explains that it “emphasizes the process of repetition and the continued awareness of some “original” behavior” (47) and that it “involves behaving as if one is someone else or even oneself in other states of feeling or being” (47). Through their mutual connection to the concept of mimesis, play and performance are tightly intertwined. Accepting this strong link between play and performance, the current chapter will attempt to underscore this bond by specifically tying certain key conflict-oriented performances in *AdG* with specific types of play. This will demonstrate Montalvo’s dependence on play and conflict in the creation of his work and help situate the text within the previously described fifteenth-century Iberian Peninsula accustomed to seeing play and conflict living side by side on a daily basis.

The first grouping of conflictive performances in *AdG* can be traced to a form of secretive play. For this reason, I label these performances as “secretive performances”. As Huizinga points out, secretiveness and play are strongly connected: “The exceptional and special position of play is most tellingly illustrated by the fact that it loves to surround itself with an air of secrecy” (*Homo Ludens* 31). In order to better understand how the secretive nature of play can manifest itself in chivalric performances, I combine Caillois’ concept of “mimicry” (19) along with Schechner’s idea of “dark play” (12) to analyze several key moments of *AdG*. Caillois’ concept of mimicry states:

Play can consist not only of deploying actions or submitting to one’s fate in an imaginary milieu, but of becoming an illusory character oneself, and of so behaving. One is thus confronted with a diverse series of manifestations, the common element of which is that the subject makes believe or makes others believe that he is someone other than himself. He forgets, disguises, or temporarily sheds his personality in order to feign another. (19)

In other words, mimicry is a type of secretive performance and the actions of Amadís and others who disguise themselves to engage in battle can certainly be described using Caillois' definition. Additionally, characters' disguises often bring them temporary moments of satisfaction which can best be explained by Schechner's concept of dark play:

Dark play subverts order, dissolves frames, breaks its own rules, so that the playing itself is in danger of being destroyed, as in spying, con-games, undercover actions, and double agency. Unlike the inversions of carnivals, ritual clowns, and so on (whose agendas are public), dark play's inversions are not declared or resolved; its end is not integration but disruption, deceit, excess, and gratification. (13)

Dark Play's inclusion of "undercover actions", "danger", and "gratification" are particularly applicable to secretive performances in *AdG* and may help explain why a character would engage in such activity in the first place. There is a certain playful element for Amadís with all of his disguises, knowing that his playing is always "in danger of being destroyed" (Schechner 13) the moment someone would recognize him. Schechner calls this undercover form of dark play "masking", and he elaborates on the pleasures that it can provide the player: "Masking is very important-sneaking off, not being recognized, playing out selves that cannot be displayed at work, or with family. The thrill and gratification of such playing is to perform anonymously, in disguise, or in a closet what one cannot do publicly "as myself"" ("Playing" 14). My analysis will show that Amadís relies heavily upon mimicry to achieve his goals, and that in most cases some form of dark play is present during these moments as well.

My second category of performances is marked by the competitive nature of play, and thus I label activities within this group as "competitive performances". The competitive qualities

of play can best be described through the ideas of Huizinga and Caillois who see a strong relationship between play, games, and competition. In his discussion of performance, Carlson states that, “Huizenga [*sic.*] and Caillois see battles or contests as one central preoccupation of play” (21). In fact, Huizinga sees competition not only as play, but as a game: “The contest has all the formal and most of the functional features of a game” (*Homo Ludens* 69). *AdG* is replete with examples of formalized competitive behavior, performed in a public setting with rules, prizes, winners, and losers. Whether in the form of war or other formally arranged battles, many performances in *AdG* are tied to the ludic concept of competition.

Finally, the third category of performances presented in this chapter can best be explained through Diane Ackerman’s theory of Deep Play.⁶⁷ Ackerman refers to deep play as “the ecstatic form of play. In its thrall, all the play elements are visible, but they’re taken to intense and transcendental heights. Thus, deep play should really be classified by mood, not activity” (12). Ackerman goes on to state that, “Deep play is a fascinating hallmark of being human; it reveals our need to seek a special brand of transcendence, with a passion that makes thrill-seeking explicable, creativity possible, and religion inevitable” (17). As one can tell by deep play’s connection to “religion”, as well as the “transcendental heights” (Ackerman 17) to which deep play can transport an individual, this form of play is more personal and all-encompassing than other forms of play. As Ackerman states, this form of play is often more a mood than an activity and could easily occur during any other forms of play, including the previous two categories of competitive and secretive play. Despite its all-encompassing nature, there are specific moments in *AdG* which can be considered “transcendental” performances, thus linking them back more closely to deep play than to any other of the play categories. Knighting ceremonies, struggles

⁶⁷ Ackerman explains that she has “borrowed the phrase *deep play* from Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), the father of utilitarianism” (18).

against magic, and other public performances to prove ones' self could fit well into the deep play category.

Many of the key performances in *AdG* can be placed into these three manifestations of play. In some cases, these categories can certainly overlap, but observing each category distinctly will help to dissect the performances in *AdG* and better explain the ludic foundations of such conflictive chivalric activities. What follows is a categorization of several key performances in *AdG* into one of the three aforementioned play categories.

Performance and Secretive Play

There are several examples of conflictive performances in Rodríguez de Montalvo's text which are linked to secretive play. These are public displays to increase a character's power or reputation while disguising the true identity and intentions of the actor. While engaging in a performance by itself can be considered playful, many performers in *AdG* will also experience a form of Schechner's aforementioned "dark play", due to the "gratification" that the disguise will provide. Amadís acts out the overwhelming majority of secretive performances in *AdG* and he often achieves success through a series of name changes. Amadís will be known under the assumed names of Beltenebros, Caballero de la Sierpe, El Cavallero de la Verde Spada, and El Caballero Griego.⁶⁸

Amadís first changes his name after a misunderstanding with his beloved Oriana, which has left him inconsolable. A monk finds Amadís in this saddened state, and before taking him to the Peña Pobre to live out an ascetic lifestyle, the monk confers upon Amadís the new name of

⁶⁸ These are the changes that occur after being recognized as Amadís de Gaula.

Beltenebros: “Yo vos quiero poner un nombre que será conforme a vuestra persona y angustia en que sois puesto, que vos sois mancebo y muy hermoso y vuestra vida está en grande amargura y en tinieblas; quiero que hayáis nombre Beltenebros” (709). Directly following the name change, the narrator quickly mentions all of the future deeds that Amadís will perform under this new secret identity: “y por este nombre fue él llamado en cuanto con él bivió, y después gran tiempo que no menos que por el de Amadís fue loado, según las grandes cosas que hizo, como adelante se dirá” (709). As the narrator indicates, though given this name by the monk, Amadís will continue to perform “grandes cosas” (709) under this secret identity for quite some time in the text, even after clearing up the misunderstanding with Oriana that caused the original name change.

Before introducing himself to the world as Beltenebros, and thus engaging in a series of chivalric performances under this name, Amadís does engage in a performance at the Peña Pobre in the form of a song or “canción” (731), which he sings in the forest:

Pues se me niega vitoria
do justo m’era devida,
allí do muere la gloria
es gloria morir la vida. (731)

Louise Haywood has explained that the term “canción was used to refer both to poems intended for reading and recitation and to lyrics for sung performances” (“Reading” 137). Furthermore, Huizinga saw song and poetry as a form of play: “Indeed, rhythm and harmony are factors of all three-poetry, music, and play” (*Homo Ludens* 182). Although Amadís sings in solitude, this song would appear to be a performance before God considering that when he is interrupted by Corisanda and her company due to their music playing he states: “con vuestro muy dulce tañer

me fezistes perder los maitines” (732). Furthermore, in a footnote to this scene Cacho Blecua observes: “Por vez primera el mundo sensorial penetra en la vida de Beltenebros, habiéndole apartado de su preocupación religiosa por escuchar canciones humanas” (732). In other words, Beltenebros’ song was a form of religious performance taking place before God. Furthermore, Beltenebros later performs the song for a human audience when Corisanda requests that he sing for her doncellas: “Entonces se fue con las dozellas a la capilla y mostróles la cántica, que él tenía muy estraña boz y la gran tristeza suya gela fazía más dulce y acordada” (737). And so, disguised as Beltenebros, Amadís begins performing through song, though he will soon move on to more public displays of self-expression to prove his love and strength.

Once ready to rejoin the world after receiving a conciliatory letter from Oriana, and still hoping to maintain his secret identity, Beltenebros orders a disguise: “mandó a Enil le fiziese fazer en aquella villa cerca donde estava unas armas, el campo verde y leones de oro menudos cuantos en él cupiessen, con sus sobreseñales, y le comprasse un buen cavallo y una espada y la mejor loriga que aver pudiesse” (774). Before facing the world as Beltenebros, Amadís wants to guarantee that he will not be recognized. This sort of preparation to interact with the world has been noted by Goffman as a “front”, which “is the expressive equipment of a standard kind intentionally or unwittingly employed by the individual during his performance” (*The Presentation* 22). A person’s front can include, among other things, “insignia of office or rank” and “clothing” (Goffman, *The Presentation* 24). Here, Amadís has chosen armor with new, unrecognizable, patterns as his primary “front” during his undercover activities. Presumably, this is so that he can make his way to Miraflores to secretly spend time with Oriana (775). In other words, his disguise and subsequent masked performances have the ultimate goal of reaching Oriana undetected so that he can engage in a form of “sexual play”, which the reader may recall

from my analysis of *Sla* in chapter one is also a form of “adult play” (Frey 56). Considering his goal of reaching Oriana, Amadís’ subsequent disguised battles along the way to Miraflores are especially ludic because their ultimate purpose is to engage in sexual play and gratification. Further discussion about the playful nature of Amadís’ eventual reunion with Oriana will be discussed shortly, but it may be best to trace his journey to Miraflores from its beginning stages.

Once his identity is concealed due to his new armor, Amadís begins his journey to Miraflores. The narrator makes a point to mention that he wore his “yelmo en la cabeça por no ser conocido” (776). Disguised as Beltenebros, Amadís engages in a public battle, thus performing his strength and greatness, within days of leaving Peña Pobre. This time, he fights Cuadragante, brother of King Abiés of Ireland, whom Amadís had defeated earlier in the text:

Entonces se acometieron tan bravamente, que espanto era de lo ver, que el ruido que con las espadas se fazían en se cortar las armas era tal como si allí se combatiesen diez caballeros, y algunas vezes se travavan a braços por se derribar; así que cada uno provava toda su fuerça y valentía contra el otro. (779)

As the narrator indicates, the two knights engage in battle to prove their “fuerça” and “valentía”, and all of this is done in front of “Unos escuderos que los miravan” (779). The reader later finds out that this particular battle also had other observers as well: “falló una donzella...y otras tres donzellas con ella que vieran la batalla y oyeran todo lo más de las palabras que passaron” (780), thus making this encounter a public spectacle and performance, yet ultimately carried out in disguise.

Once he defeats Cuadragante, Beltenebros orders the defeated knight to travel to the court of King Lisuarte and await the arrival of Amadís:

Yo vos mando, por el pleito que fazéis, que luego seáis en la corte del rey Lisuarte y que vos no partáis dende fasta que Amadís allí sea, aquel que vos andáis buscando; y venido, vos metáis en su poder y le perdonéis la muerte de vuestro hermano el rey Abiés de Irlanda. (780)

The reader could speculate that with this statement Beltenebros may have experienced a small sense of Schechner's aforementioned dark play which contains "gratification" through "masking" ("Playing" 14). Although there are no indications in the text, one can suspect that Amadís may have been amused with sending Cuadragante off to await the very man that had just defeated him in disguise. Schechner explains that dark play may be "entirely private, known to the player alone" (12), and while Rodríguez de Montalvo does not describe Amadís smiling underneath his helmet, there is a ludic quality to this interaction since Cuadragante is basically "fooled" into seeking out the man standing right in front of him. In dark play, the nonplayer's reaction provides a crucial stimulus for the ludic interaction (Schechner 14). There is no indication that Cuadragante suspects that Beltenebros is Amadís, and he quickly carries out his orders (780). Although the text does not provide Amadís' reaction to his victory, all of the conditions for dark play would appear to be present in this situation. Beltenebros' satisfaction with his disguised performance is more explicitly described in his very next challenge.

The opportunity for disguised, secretive performance and dark play will arise yet again when Beltenebros agrees to joust with knights from King Lisuarte's court whom he knows well. Oriana's sister Leonoreta sends one of her ladies to ask Beltenebros to participate: "y ella y todas las donzellas vos mandan rogar que mantengades la justa aquellos cavalleros" (782). In his study of medieval and Renaissance jousting in Iberia, Noel Fallows clearly sees the jouster as a performer as he states: "In the case of jousts, individual performance was paramount and every

action and manoeuvre was closely scrutinized with a view to awarding points to each jouster” (7). Jousting is an easily recognizable chivalric performance and Amadís defeats all of the knights except for one who is able to stay on his horse (784). Not only is Amadís engaged in a moment of disguised performance, but once again may have engaged in a moment of dark play as well, gaining some level of satisfaction after successfully and secretly defeating his friends without revealing his identity: “Beltenebros se partió dellos muy alegre de cómo le aviniera, y fuese por su camino hablando con Enil, y iba mirando la lança que le fincara, que le parecía muy buena” (785). According to Schechner, the element of disguise during dark play produces “thrill and gratification” (14), and Amadís has certainly achieved this in his successful jousting match.

Amadís will engage in yet another public yet secretive performance under his new identity as Beltenebros when he defeats the giants Famongomadán and Basagante. This time he frees several knights and “*donzellas*”, including King Lisuarte’s younger daughter Leonoreta, who is captured shortly after the recently described jousting match. Performing his physical strength against the giant Basagante, Beltenebros “le dio con la acha por encima del yelmo un tan grande golpe, que por fuerça se le quebraron todos los lazos y fizogelo saltar de la cabeça” (789). The battle is not carried out in private, but rather in plain sight and Leonoreta and her ladies witness the entire battle: “Los que miravan cuidaron que la media cabeça le cortara, y fizieron gran duelo, especialmente Leonoreta con sus niñas y donzellas, que de rodillas en la carreta estaban, alçadas las manos al cielo, rogando a Dios que de aquel peligro las librasse” (790). In the midst of this public spectacle, Amadís loses his helmet and is quick to put on the giant’s helmet to conceal his identity after his victory: “tomó el yelmo de Basagante y púsolo en su cabeça porque le no conoçiessen” (791). In other words, Amadís needs to quickly put on the helmet in order to maintain his secret identity and maintain his performative “front” (Goffman,

The Presentation 22). The helmet is an integral part of Amadis' "front" while performing as Beltenebros and he is quick to protect that part of his identity. In this case, he wishes to maintain the ruse that he has started in front of Leonoreta and the knights accompanying her. While certainly no harm would come to him by revealing his identity at this moment, after all, he has just rescued his friends, he clearly does not wish for his secretive performances to end so quickly for his real goal is another form of "gratification" in the arms of his beloved Oriana.

When Beltenebros reaches Oriana in Miraflores, all of his disguised activity pays off as he finds the "gratification" that he was seeking: "Allí fue Beltenebros aposentado en la cámara de Oriana, donde, según las cosas passadas que ya havéis oído, se puede creer que para él muy más agradable le sería que el mismo Paraíso. Allí estuvo con su señora ocho días" (794). The reader may recall from chapter one's discussion of Ardanlyer's carnal desires that sexual activity has also been seen as a form of play. In this context, Frey explains that "Sexual behavior, therefore, is considered to be a form of adult play because it possesses all of the characteristics typical of play in the paratelic state: emphasis on immediate gratification" (56). Like dark play, sexual play has gratification at its very core.

After engaging in sexual play, the narrator describes Amadís and Oriana moving on to other forms of play when Gandalín arrives at Miraflores to find Beltenebros and Oriana playing chess: "entró en el patín de los hermosos árboles, donde jugando al axedrés hallo a Beltenebros con Oriana" (799). Here Beltenebros' play takes the shape of a formalized game. Perhaps after experiencing the play of performance, dark play, and then sexual play, Beltenebros was ready to channel his playful tendencies into a more organized play experience such as chess. After all, chapter three of this dissertation presented the idea that excessive play in a courtly setting manifested itself in a tendency toward the strategic thinking involved in chess, and Beltenebros'

playful energies would clearly need to be redirected somewhere as he lounged around Miraflores. In his pursuit of sexual gratification, Amadís has engaged in disguised playful performance, experienced moments of dark play, engaged in days of sexual play, and finally began to explore strategic play in the form of chess. In summary, his entire trip to Miraflores would seem to be marked by play.

From the moment Amadís arrives in Miraflores Oriana is an equal partner in Amadís's playful activities, and like Amadís, she too will begin to disguise herself to achieve her objectives. The couple soon decides to disguise themselves to prove that they are the greatest lovers to have ever existed. When Gandalín interrupts the aforementioned chess match it is to inform the pair what he has witnessed at court. An “escudero viejo” (797) has appeared at court with a half-sheathed sword and a crown of flowers, with one half composed of fresh flowers and the other half appearing withered away (796). This “escudero” informs the king that the only person that can pull the sword from its sheath is “el cavallero que más que ninguno en el mundo a su amiga amare” (796). Likewise, the only woman who can make all of the flowers bloom is the one “que a su marido o amigo en aquel grado que el cavallero amare” (796-797). Amadís and Oriana quickly decide to accept this challenge and begin preparations to return to the court of Oriana's father for their public, yet secretive performance. While not a physical battle, the situation will still be agonistic at its core as they will have competitors and will either win or lose the challenge.

Provided that their union is still a secret, they will have to attempt this challenge in disguise. Beltenebros already has his disguise, but Oriana too must prepare a costume for her upcoming performance. Mabilia provides Oriana with a “capa” which they are sure will keep her identity a secret:

La reina mi madre me embió con las otras donas que la Donzella de Denamarcha me traxo, una capa muy hermosa y bien hecha que nunca se vistió ni se ha visto en toda esta tierra, y aquélla será para que vos, señora, levéis; y luego la traxeron ende y metieron a Oriana en una cámara, y vestiéndole de la forma que había de ir, con sus lúas en las manos y sus antifaces, la traxeron delante Beltenebros, y por mucho que él y ellas la miraron a todas partes, nunca pudieron hallar cosa por donde conoçida dellas ni de ninguno otro ser pudiesse. (800-801).

Like Amadís, Oriana will rely on a “front” (Goffman, *The Presentation* 22) in order to have a successful performance. Perhaps recognizing the ludic nature of the situation, Beltenebros wittily remarks: “Nunca pensé, señora, que tan alegre fuera de vos no ver ni conoçer” (801).

Beltenebros clearly seems amused by the disguise and his remark demonstrates that he is enjoying all of this undercover play.

When the two lovers arrive at King Lisuarte’s court for the challenge, there too they find a lighthearted atmosphere with the participants joking amongst themselves. The escudero viejo, Macondón, points out how little the other knights have moved the sword from its sheath while Dragonís, in turn, pokes fun at the escudero’s age (806). The narrator states that “Todos se rieron de lo que Dragonís dixo” (806). Likewise, the escudero Macondón continues his lighthearted jabs as the doncellas try on the crown of flowers: “y a todas dezía Macandón cosas de burla y de plazer” (808). In other words, there would appear to be a playful and festive atmosphere directly before Amadís and Oriana publicly demonstrate their love for one another.

Amadís’ chance to try his luck with the enchanted sword soon arrives and not surprisingly he easily removes it from its sheath: “Mas él tomó la espada y sacándola toda de la

vaina, luego lo ardiente fue tan claro como la otra media” (807). The captivated audience immediately applauds his success: “el loor suyo fue tan grande por todos y todas las que en el palacio estaban de armas y de amores” (807). Amadís, as Beltenebros, has publicly performed and proven his love for his wife. Oriana quickly proves her love for Amadís as well: “pusieronle el tocado en la cabeça, y luego las flores secas se tornaron tan verdes y tan hermosas, de manera que no se podía conocer cuáles fueron las unas ni las otras” (809). In essence, both have publicly performed and successfully proven their love for one another all while in disguise. One could speculate that the pair could easily have experienced Schechner’s aforementioned “dark play” (12). The narrator confirms that a ludic performance occurred with the observation: “muy alegres que sus aventuras tan bien acabaran” (811). In other words, this was yet another example of a ludic performance carried out with the help of a disguise.

Amadís eventually reveals the true identity of Beltenebros during King Lisuarte’s battle against King Cildadán with a theatrical rallying cry of “¡Gaula, Gaula, que soy Amadís!” (826), but he will soon need to take on a new disguise when he decides to join King Lisuarte’s battle against “el rey Arávigo” (1047). After a dispute with King Lisuarte, Amadís returns to his homeland of Gaula where his inactivity prompts some to question his honor and commitment to battle (1034). Public opinion appears to motivate Amadís to join the battle against “el rey Arávigo” for the very night that he learns of people’s doubts about him, the narrator states: “Amadís no podía dormir pensando en dos cosas: la una, en fazer tanto aquel año en armas que lo [que] dél avian dicho con lo contrario se purgasse; el otra, qué faría en aquella batalla que se esperaba, que según la grandeza della no podía él sin gran vergüença escusarse no ser en ella” (1034). He gives additional reasons for joining the battle such as helping Oriana retain her land

(1034), but clearly his first thoughts are on the public performance opportunities to clear his name, which are only to be found in the conflict.

The following day, Amadís clarifies his need to perform once again to his father Perión and his brother Florestán when he states:

Y como yo aya estado tanto tiempo sin exercitar mi persona, y con ello aya cobrado tan mala fama como vos, hermano sabéis, en fin de mi cuidado determiné ser en ella y de la parte del rey Lisuarte, no por le tener amor, mas por dos cosas que agora oiréis: la primera, por tener menos gente, a que todo bueno debe socorrer; la segunda, porque mi pensamiento es de morir allí, o fazer más que en ninguna parte donde me fallasse. (1035)

Provided that he wishes to publicly “exercitar” his “persona” in order to rise above the rest and regain his sense of honor, one could say that at his very core Amadís has what Nicolas Evreinoff terms, “The instinct of theatricalization” (23) which he explains, “may be best described as the desire to be ‘different,’ to do something that is ‘different,’ to imagine oneself in surroundings that are ‘different’ from the commonplace surroundings of our everyday life” (23). Amadís has grown tired of “the commonplace surroundings” in his homeland of Gaula and wishes to show the world that he is still different from others, that he is still better than all of the rest.

In order to fulfill his “theatrical instinct” to publicly perform, Amadís will need to once again rely on a disguise since he is no longer serving King Lisuarte in any official capacity due to their dispute: “Pero mi ida será tan encubierta, que a todo mi poder no seré conocido” (1035). His disguise turns his subsequent performance in the battle into a secretive performance. Like he did with Oriana, Amadís will also recruit others to join him in his secretive performance. This time, he seeks the help of his father Perión and his brother Florestán. He explains that in order

for their undercover performance to work, they will need to choose a disguise which will be distinct from all the rest: “Solamente queda en darse orden cómo encubiertos vamos, y con armas señaladas y conocidas que nos guíen a que socorrernos podamos; que si más gente llevássedes, imposible sería nuestra ida ser secreta” (1036). Having disguised himself as Beltenebros, and after observing Oriana with her secretive costume, Amadís appears to know the importance of a good disguise.

At the moment the royal family is about to choose their armor, a messenger from Urganda, the mysterious woman known for her prophecies and magical activity throughout the text, appears with special armor for all three:

sacó dél tres scudos, el campo de plata y sierpes de oro por él tan estrañamente puestas, que no parecían sino bivas, y las orlas eran de fino oro con piedras preciosas. Y luego sacó tres sobreseñales de aquella misma obra que los escudos, y tres yelmos, diversos unos de otros, el uno blanco, y el otro cárdeno, y el otro dorado. El blanco con el un escudo y su sobreseñal dio al rey Perión, y lo cárdeno, a don Florestán, y el dorado con lo otro, a Amadís. (1036)

Urganda also hopes that the armor will improve Amadís’ performance: “Señor Amadís, mi señora os embía estas armas, y dízeos que obréis mejor con ellas que lo havéis fecho después que en esta tierra entrastes” (1037). Perión and his two sons soon make their way to the battle, making a dramatic and public entrance all while donning their new armor:

Mas a esta sazón era ya llegado a la vega el rey Perión y sus fijos Amadís y Florestán en sus hermosos cavallos y con las armas de las sierpes, que mucho con el sol resplandecían; y veníanse derechos a poner entre los unos y los otros, blandiendo sus lanças con unos

fierros tan limpios, que luzían como estrellas; y iba el padre entre los hijos. Mucho fueron mirados de ambas las partes, y de grado los quisiera cada una dellas de su parte. (1040)

The words, “mucho fueron mirados” (1040) indicate that they immediately become a public spectacle as they enter the battlefield. Once the battle commences, they all perform their strength and skills admirably: “Y luego pusieron mano a las espadas, y passaron por aquella haz primera derribando cuantos ante sí fallavan, y dieron en la otra segunda. Y cuando así se vieron en medio de entrambas, allí pudiérades ver las sus grandes maravillas que con las espadas fazían” (1040). With their help, King Lisuarte wins the battle and the trio from Gaula quickly escapes into the forest to maintain their secret identities.

Just as he did under the name of Beltenebros, Amadís has chosen to prove his strength and power with the help of a mask. What distinguishes his time as the Caballero de la Sierpe is that he relies on this disguised play and conflict behavior to help him rebuild his damaged reputation and public identity due to his inactivity, whereas his previous costumed performances/battles had more carnal motivations. As Carlson explains, performance theorists have acknowledged the relationship between performance and the construction of identity: “Other theorists have given performance a much more positive and creative function, suggesting that performance, far from standing in the way of the development of the self, provides in fact the means by which, wholly or in large part, the self is actually constituted” (40). One theorist mentioned by Carlson who connects performance and self-identity is J.L. Moreno: “Moreno argues that roles do not emerge from the self but the self emerges from roles” (Carlson 41-42). In other words, if we apply this concept to *AdG*, Amadís hopes that performing his “role” as the Caballero de la Sierpe will once again reestablish his identity. This will be Amadís’ motivation

for most of his subsequent masked performances under different names as well. Identity (re)-construction would seem to be at the heart of Amadís' playful behavior.⁶⁹

As previously mentioned, Schechner views attempts at reestablishing a previous behavior as a key element of performance (Carlson 47). In this case, Amadís' original performances of strength and valor, as well as those of all the great knights who came before him, serve as the model which the Caballero de la Sierpe is attempting to match or surpass. Amadís' disguised performance will only be truly restorative if others learn that he was the Caballero de la Sierpe, which does happen later in the story (1079-1080). Otherwise, Amadís will gain no fame or glory from his actions. Once again, dark play would seem to be retroactively applicable to this situation since it is "the retelling of these events, their reperformance as narratives, that they are cast as play" (Schechner 14). Without the eventual retelling of his martial deeds (1079-1080), Amadís could not expect his time in battle to contribute to the restoration of his honor, nor would the full ludic nature of his disguised performance be appreciated. With his quick escape into the forest, Amadís appears willing to postpone the reestablishment of his good name and delay his "gratification" for a later time.

The battle against el rey Áravigo is only the beginning of Amadís' journey toward recovering his honor and glory. He soon leaves Gaula once again, looking for further opportunities to prove his worth. He will make his way to Germany where he will perform bravely under the assumed name of El Cavallero de la Verde Spada:

Y Amadís se partió de Gaula, como os ya contamos, con voluntad de hazer tales cosas en armas, que aquellos que lo habían profaçado y menoscabado su honra por la luenga

⁶⁹ Children's play has also been seen as form of self-construction. Deegan and Pellegrini assert: "pretend play with either peers or adults, because it is enjoyable, is a particularly important and motivating context in children's learning and development" (114).

estada que por mandado de su señora allí fiziera quedasen por mentirosos; y con este pensamiento se metió por la tierra de Alemaña, donde en poco tiempo fue conoçido, que mucho y muchas venían a él con tuertos y agravios que les eran fechos, y les fazía alcançar su derecho, pasando grandes afrentas y peligros de su persona, combatiéndose en muchas partes con valientes caballeros... Tanto fizo que por toda alemaña era conoçido por el mejor caballero que en toda aquella tierra entrara, y no le sabían otro nombre sino el Cavallero de la Verde Spada, o del Enano, por el enano que consigo traía. (1083)

For a man wishing to restore his good name and promote his prowess in battle, Amadís is surprisingly unwilling to divulge his true identity during his travels. Instead, he chooses to employ a disguise in order to engage in public performances of strength, keeping the truth only to himself, and waiting for later satisfaction when others will learn his true identity. As previously mentioned, in some cases dark play only reveals itself after the fact, and it is in the, “telling of these events, their reperformance as narratives, that they are cast as play” (Schechner 14). In other words, undercover actions can be a form of secretive play for the performer, but they can fully be called play by everyone once they are revealed to a larger public who can appreciate the original secretive activities. In fact, Amadís does eventually reveal his identity to King Taminor: “ahunque por mi voluntad no sea, sabed que yo soy aquel Amadís de Gaula, fijo del rey Perión” (1102). The king proceeds to have Amadís’ actions committed to writing: “fizo escribir todas las cosas que en armas por aquellas tierras passó” (1102). In other words, King

Tafinor will provide a way for Amadís' undercover performances to be retold, and thus be appreciated for generations as the undercover dark play that it is.⁷⁰

Not only are Amadís' acts of valor written down in a foreign land, but news of Amadís' undercover performances verbally reach back to Great Britain at the court of King Lisuarte. When Queen Sardamira visits Oriana, she mentions Amadís by name and then states: "lo llaman el Cavallero de la Verde Spada o el Cavallero del Enano, y a cada uno dessos nombres responde él cuando lo llaman" (1222). Despite his initial attempts to conceal his identity, this sort of public retelling of Amadís' exploits would be needed for him to feel vindicated in the eyes of his detractors. However, once his secret identity is known, Amadís will need to make one last costume change when he returns to Great Britain as the Cavallero Griego.

Amadís will convert into the Cavallero Griego when he agrees to fight on Grasinda's behalf at King Lisuarte's court to prove her superior beauty. As Grasinda states in her letter to King Lisuarte, "como yo fue juzgada por las más hermosa dueña de todas las de Romanía, así, siguiendo aquella gloria que mi corazón tan ledo fizo, lo quiero ser más que ninguna de cuantas doncellas en vuestra corte son" (1242). In short, Amadís has agreed to help Grasinda to win a beauty contest. As Grasinda states in her letter, she was so "ledo" from her previous victory that she wishes to extend that enjoyment even further. In order to provide her with this happiness, Amadís will need to perform his strength and valor by defeating any challenger offered by King Lisuarte and his court. In order to avoid recognition, Amadís will once again need to change his name and appearance.

⁷⁰ Schechner sees these types of events as "reperformance as narratives" (14).

Upon his arrival in Great Britain, Amadís puts much care into securing his secret identity. He starts to construct his “front” (Goffman, *The Presentation* 22) by asking his companions to address him as the Caballero Griego: “rogó a todos los hombres que en ellas eran que lo no llamassen por otro nombre sino el Cavallero Griego” (1230). In addition to the name change, Amadís will complete his disguise by exchanging his “green” sword for one less recognizable: “Y el Cavallero Griego tomó otra para sí, y mandó a Gandalín que, guardando la verde suya donde la no viessen, aquélla pusiesse con sus armas. Esto fazía él porque en la corte del rey Lisuarte, donde él iva y se quería encubrir, no fuesse por la verde espada descubierto” (1231). The day of the battle, Amadís is no less cautious about his appearance. He arrives well disguised in armor that nobody will recognize: “la loriga era tan alva como la luna, y las sobreseñales de la misma librea y colores que Grasinda era vestida, y abrochávase de una y otra parte con cuerdas texidas de oro, y el yelmo y el escudo eran pintados de las mesmas señales de la sobrevista” (1250). He adds to the performance by only speaking in Greek: “Yo soy un cavallero estraño que del imperio de Grecia vengo con pensamiento de me probar con tus caballeros que tan buenos son” (1251). Amadís stands before King Lisuarte, well-known friends, the queen, and other, “donzellas de gran guisa” (1251), and he is totally disguised and speaking a foreign language. Clearly, Amadís is performing and his actions would appear to fit well with Caillois’ description of mimicry which states that an individual “temporarily sheds his personality in order to feign another” (19). Of course the subsequent battle is a performance in its own right due to Amadís’ public demonstration of his skill at arms, but even this moment before the battle, with Amadís tricking everyone he knows into thinking that he is Greek has an overt performative quality. Amadís carries the performance all the way to the end for even after defeating one of his adversaries he indicates that he does not understand the man’s pleas for leniency: “Mas el

Cavallero Griego mostrava que lo no entendía” (1259). Amadís stays in character the entire time, once again signaling that he does not understand the local language when a second request for leniency is made: “Él dava a conocer que lo no entendía. Y Esplandián comenzó a llamar a altas bozes al conde Argamón que se llegasse allí, que el Cavallero Griego no le entendía su lenguaje” (1259). Part of Amadís’ performance is to convince others that he is Greek and he accomplishes this task quite effectively. Actors frequently convince their audience members to believe what they are presenting. Goffman explains an individual’s need to elicit a specific response from an observer by stating: “Sometimes the individual will act in a thoroughly calculating manner, expressing himself in a given way solely in order to give the kind of impression to others that is likely to evoke from them a specific response he is concerned to obtain” (*The Presentation* 6). In Amadís’ case, he wishes to maintain the impression that he is Greek, and as recently mentioned, he was quick to point out that he did not understand the local language.

After the battle, the narrator describes both Amadís and Grasinda as pleased with the outcome: “Estonces movieron de allí contra las fustas, y Grasinda con gran gloria y alegría de su ánimo, y no menos el griego caballero en haver parado tales a los romanos, de que muchas gracias a Dios dava” (1261). Amadís is clearly pleased with the outcome of events. The reader cannot help but speculate that part of that happiness would have to have come from his success at disguising his identity from King Lisuarte and his court. If that is the case, it would be one more example of the secretive “gratification” that one can attain through dark play’s “masking” (Schechner 14). Even if no dark play were present, this moment could still be considered ludic due to his elaborate disguise and performance.

While Amadís’s acting abilities are certainly highlighted in his portrayal of the Caballero Griego, one must not forget that at the heart of all of his disguised playing is the element of

competition, an activity which Huizinga and others have linked to the concept of play. During his appearance as the Caballero Griego, Amadís competes in order to win Grasinda the beauty title she so desires. Elements of competition and contest do not limit themselves to Amadís' masked adventures, but can be found throughout the text. The following section will briefly highlight some of *AdG*'s competitive moments in which elements of play and game can clearly be detected.

Performance and Competition

A large number of Amadís' physical performances can easily trace their roots to public competition, an activity grounded in the play concept.⁷¹ In nearly every single public performance of strength, Amadís and other knights in the text are competing against a worthy opponent. Ultimately, there are winners and losers, and in some cases actual prizes, like the aforementioned beauty title defended by the Cavallero Griego. Competition is so integral to *AdG* that its own direct connections to the concept of play cannot be ignored. A few very brief examples should suffice to show how knightly performance can trace its roots to the ludic and game-like origins of competition.

In contrast to the countless random battles which occur due to chance encounters between knights in the forest, there are several examples of more formalized, pre-arranged, one-on-one battles with rules and a more tangible "prize". Amadís' public battle to prove Grasinda's beauty was particularly demonstrative of this type of formalized contest. Amadís' first performance at

⁷¹ As Huizinga points out: "The *agon* in Greek life, or the contest anywhere else in the world, bears all the formal characteristics of play and, as to its function, belongs almost wholly to the sphere of the festival, which is the play-sphere" (*Homo Ludens* 50). In addition to calling *agon* or contest play, Huizinga goes on to more specifically call it a game as well: "The contest has all the formal and most of the functional features of a game" (*Homo Ludens* 69).

King Lisuarte's court, the battle with Dardán, is also characterized by its more formalized, contest-like, nature. As Amadís approaches King Lisuarte's court, he encounters "dos donzellas" (361) who tell him about Dardán's attempt to rob a noble lady of her land in order to please the woman's step-daughter, who has set certain conditions for intimate contact with the knight: "jamás le haría amor si la no llevasse a casa del rey Lisuarte y dicesse que el aver de su madrastra devía ser suyo, y que sobre esta razón se combatiesse con quien dicesse el contrario" (362). Dardán quickly challenges his lady's step-mother for her land, which initiates a judicial competition in which the winner will take all: "y fizolo él assí como lo mandó su amiga; y la otra dueña no fuera tan bien razonada como le fuera menester y dixo que daría provador ante el Rey por sí, y esto fizo por el gran derecho que tiene, cuidando hallar quien lo mantuviesse por ella" (362). In other words, though she has no need to do so, the noble woman accepts Dardán's challenge.

By agreeing to present a "provador ante el Rey" to defend her rights, the noble woman has, in effect, entered into a legal agreement with Dardán which stipulates that the victor of the battle will own her land. Even this legal conflict can trace its roots to play. Huizinga makes the case that law and play are closely connected precisely because of the idea of contest:

That an affinity may exist between law and play becomes obvious to us as soon as we realize how much the actual practice of the law, in other words a lawsuit, properly resembles a contest whatever the ideal foundations of the law may be... In Greece, litigation was considered as an agon, a contest bound by fixed rules and sacred in form, where the two contending parties invoked the decision of an arbiter. (*Homo Ludens* 97)

As Huizinga claims, most legal contests will have rules and an “arbiter”, and the case with Dardán is no different. King Lisuarte serves as an arbiter and follows the rules even when it pains him to do so: “Y el Rey ovo della muy gran duelo, porque era buena dueña. Dardán se paró en la plaça donde havía de atender hasta hora de tercia así armado, y si no viniesse a él ningún caballero, darle ía el Rey su juicio, que así era costumbre” (369). Not only are there formalized rules to this contest, but there is a prize as well, which in this case is the land. Of course, Dardán is only interested in the land because the woman’s step-daughter will not sleep with him until she gets it. In this sense, Dardán’s true motivation and prize are linked back to a form of “sexual play” (Frey 56). With reference to the nature of competition, Huizinga reminds us that “We play or compete ‘for’ something...Every game has its stake. It can be of material or symbolic value, but also ideal” (*Homo Ludens* 71). In this case the “stake” is not only the material and symbolic value of the woman’s land, but also Amadís’ honor and chance to prove himself at the court of his beloved Oriana. Huizinga also adds that “The object for which we play and compete is first and foremost victory...The fruits of victory may be honour, esteem, prestige” (*Homo Ludens* 71). The common thread between law and play is contest, and in this case, the rules and prizes associated with this legal battle create ludic and game-like conditions in which Amadís’ subsequent competitive, physical, performance will flourish.

Amadís quickly makes his way onto the designated battlefield and immediately becomes the object of spectacle: “Cuando el Rey y los de la villa vieron al cavallero salir de la floresta, mucho se maravillaron quién sería, que ninguno lo pudo conocer, mas dezían que nunca vieron caballero que tan hermoso pareçiesse armado y a cavallo” (369). Amadís and Dardán then proceed to publicly demonstrate their strength and skills with a blade: “ellos no quedavan de se

ferir por todas partes, y cada uno mostrava al otro su fuerça y ardimiento” (371). Not only do the two knights show their “fuerça” to each other, but to all of the spectators of this intense battle:

...y las gentes de la villa estaban por las torres y por el muro y por los lugares donde los mejor podían ver combatir, y las casas de la Reina eran sobre el muro y había aí muchas finiestras donde estaban muchas dueñas y donzellas, y vían la batalla de los caballeros que les parecía espantosa de ver. (371)

Amadís performs before a large audience with the hope of winning not only honor and glory, but also the noble woman’s tangible land. This scene is clearly a ludic episode when one considers play’s connection to law and contest as well as to performance in general.

The episode to save the noble woman’s land is not the only formalized contest in which Amadís performs. Prior to this encounter, Amadís had fought against King Abiés of Ireland in a similar one-on-one battle, with the entire Kingdom of Gaula at stake. In the midst of the battle between King Perión and King Abiés, Amadís and the Irish King agree to the terms of a more intimate battle:

moveros he otro partido, y podrá ser que más os agrade: vos tenéis saña de mí por lo que he fecho y yo de vos por lo que en esta tierra hazéis; pues en nuestra culpa no hay razón porque ninguno otro padezca, y sea la batalla entre mí y vos, luego si quisiéredes, con tal que vuestra gente asseguere, y la nuestra también, de se no mover hasta en fin della. (316)

With his offer of another “partido” (316), Amadís proposes to put an end to the larger contest between armies which has dragged on for some time. The situation which Amadís has proposed,

complete with rules, a winner, and a prize in the form of Gaula, sets him up for a spectacular demonstration of strength and skill.⁷²

The contest with King Abiés is not only an opportunity to “win”, but it also provides Amadís an outlet for his theatrical tendencies as well, given that his performance with a blade attracts the attention of many onlookers: “Los de la villa y los de la hueste todos se ponían donde mejor la batalla ver pudiessen, y el campo era ya señalado y el palenque fecho con muchos cadahalsos enderredor dél” (318). Considering the spectators, the “palenque,” and the “cadahalsos,” Amadís has moved the war to save Gaula into a public arena setting, turning the war into a more formalized public spectacle, where everyone can easily and clearly focus in on his skills and prowess in battle. Amadís does not disappoint the spectators of Gaula as he soon wins the upper hand in his fight against king Abiés:

Las maravillas que el Donzel hazía en andar ligero y acometedor y en dar muy duros golpes le puso en desconcierto todo su saber, y a mal de su grado no le pudiendo ya a sufrir perdía el campo, y el Donzel del Mar le acabó de deshazer en el braço todo el escudo, que nada dél le quedó, y cortávale la carne por muchas partes, assí que la sangre le salía mucha y ya no podia herir. (321)

While physical prowess is certainly at the center of this battle, Amadís also uses this very public setting to perform his verbal and philosophical skills as well. In the middle of his battle with king Abiés, Amadís exclaims: “los hombres, specialmente los reyes, no han de hacer lo que pueden mas lo que deven, porque muchas vezes acaesce que el daño y la fuerça que a los que se lo no merescieron quieren hazer a la fin caer sobre ellos y perderlo todo, y ahun la vida abueltas” (320). Amadís, a firm believer in demonstrating chivalric strength, warns king Abiés that kings,

⁷² Huizinga observes: “Closely connected with play is the idea of winning... Winning means showing oneself superior in the outcome of a game” (*Homo Ludens* 70).

however, need to think twice about the consequences of their own public behavior. Amadís continues his speech, reminding Abiés that he will soon be defeated: “y si agora querrias que te dexasse holgar, assí lo quisieran otros a quien tú, sin se lo otorgar, mucho apremiavas, y porque sientas lo que ellos sentir hazías aparéjate, que no holgarás a mi grado” (320). These words not only position Amadís as a defender of justice, but also highlight verbally the physical action that he will soon take.⁷³

Amadís’ victory quickly solidifies his ties with the men watching the battle: “Tomado el Donzel del Mar por el rey Perión y Agrajes y los otros grandes de su partida, y sacado del campo con aquella gloria que los vencedores en tales autos levar suelen, no solamente de honra mas de restitución de un reino a quien perdido lo tenía, a la villa con él se van” (322). In his commentary on winning, Huizinga states: “The object for which we play and compete is first and foremost victory, but victory is associated with all the various ways in which it can be enjoyed—for instance, as a triumph celebrated by the group with massed pomp, applause, and ovations” (*Homo Ludens* 71). This description of winning is certainly applicable to Amadís’ victory as he is ushered off the battlefield as a hero.

The tendency to engage in formalized, rule-driven battle for a specific prize recurs in King Lisuarte’s armed conflict with King Cildadán. In this engagement, both kings agree to present one hundred knights each: “que ninguno de los reyes metiesse más de cient cavalleros como assentado estava” (819). King Lisuarte is clearly committed to following the established rules and he is quick to calculate the number of knights at his disposal upon hearing that Beltenebros will join the battle: “Ya no nos falta sino un cavallero para el cumplimiento de ciento” (820). When Beltenebros arrives with Enil, whom he has recently knighted, the narrator

⁷³ For further information on the role of justice in *AdG*, see Silvia Lastra Paz, “Los procedimientos jurídico-deliberativos en el *Amadís de Gaula*”.

states: “El Rey lo recibió con mucha alegría y al cavallero suyo puso en el cumplimiento de los ciento” (821). King Lisuarte clearly plans to follow the rules agreed upon for this battle. In fact, this prearranged number of men entering into battle is reminiscent of more formalized games or contests such as the *mêlée* or tourney. In his discussion of jousting, Fallows points out the difference between these two forms of organized combat by stating: “The principal difference between the *mêlée* tournament and the tourney was one of spatial and numerical scale” (3). Elaborating further on the tourney, Fallows asserts that “the tourney could take place between two contestants or between two teams of contestants and the rules that regulated the combat were quite basic” (5). Fallows also describes how the Spanish term “torneo” was used in certain cases to refer to real world battles as well as tournaments:

In *Las Siete Partidas* (The Seven Divisions), an extensive law code compiled during the reign of King Alfonso X of Castile (1221-84; rules 1252-84), the term ‘torneo’ is used to refer to a real skirmish on the battlefield and the Alphonsine neologism ‘torneamiento’ is used to refer to the tourney with swords or clubs. As is so often the case with Alphonsine neologisms, however, the term ‘torneamiento’ did not take root beyond *Las Siete Partidas* and by the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in Castile the noun ‘torneo’ was the standard term used to refer to both the tourney and the tournament. (3-4)

Clearly there are connections between organized contests and real world battles. The organized nature of King Lisuarte’s battle, with each King permitted to have one hundred knights, gives the battle a ludic and game-like quality to it. The organized conflict creates ample opportunity for knights to perform their bravery, thus turning the battle into a stage for competitive performances.

As the battle begins, the knights maintain some level of order which seems to be in line with a battle based on rules: “Assí como oís, se fueron unos a otros con mucha ordenança y muy passo” (822). The organized aspect of the battle soon gets lost in the combat: “Mas cuando fueron llegados, encontráronse los que delante ivan tan bravamente, que muchos dellos al suelo fueron” (823). Of course, primarily this is a performance opportunity for Beltenebros who, “fazía grandes maravillas en armas” (823). In summary, Amadís, disguised as Beltenebros, has utilized this organized, game-like battle, to publicly perform his strength and martial skills.

While nearly all armed conflict between knights in *AdG* can be considered a form of competitive performance, the aforementioned examples of Amadís’ battles with Dardán, King Abiés of Ireland, and his involvement in the battle against King Cildadán demonstrated more specifically how certain competitive performances can easily be traced to ludic and game-like competitive play. Competitive performances, like the secretive performances presented previously in this chapter, are integral parts of Rodríguez de Montalvo’s work, and given their playful origins, further add to the ludic nature of the text. While competitive and secretive performances abound in the text, there is yet a third category of performances which can trace their roots to a ludic source. I designate activities in this third category as deep performances, which correspond to Ackerman’s concept of “deep play” (13).

Performance and Deep Play

Whether secretive, competitive, or otherwise, there would seem to be a group of performances in *AdG* which can trace their origins to a form of “deep play,” a term described by Diane Ackerman as the “ecstatic form of play” (12), which “should really be classified by mood, not activity” (12). Ackerman goes on to describe that mood in terms of the “sacred” (9), and a

“desire for transcendence” (9). According to Ackerman, deep play allows an individual to “happily develop new skills, test one’s limits, stretch them, and then maybe refine the skills and redefine the limits” (38). Ackerman also adds that “some activities are prone to it: art, religion, risk-taking, and some sports” (12). Huizinga too mentions the connections between play and sacred acts as he states: “it has been shown again and again how difficult it is to draw the line between, on the one hand, permanent social groupings-particularly in archaic cultures with their extremely important, solemn, indeed sacred customs-and the sphere of play on the other” (*Homo Ludens* 31). Due to its variety of possible manifestations, deep play is difficult to define, and as Ackerman explains, it is more of a “mood” (12) than any one activity. Still, despite the difficulty inherent in identifying “deep play,” Ackerman’s mention of religion, risk-taking, and a desire for transcendence, would seem to be areas that make up a medieval knight’s reality, thus making it easier to connect chivalric, conflict-oriented activity to this particular type of play.

Turning to *AdG*, one particular type of performance which is grounded in “sacred customs” (Huizinga, *Homo Ludens* 31), and designed for the participant to transcend his current status, is the knighting ceremony. In historical context, Barber has described the ceremony by stating: “From the mid-twelfth century onwards, the ceremony of knighting became the central moment in a knight’s life, whether it was the simplest of ceremonies or a great extravaganza belonging to the most elaborate kind of chivalry” (32). The entire knighting ceremony is a performance based on a sacred ritual in pursuit of transcendence, and therefore can easily be said to have its origins in deep play.⁷⁴ In other words, the knighting ceremony can be considered a “deep” performance.

⁷⁴ Cacho Blecua has also noted the transcendental nature of the knighting ceremony by stating that “Los ritos de la investidura, de procedencia germánica, suponían en su origen un cambio de clase: pasar de la clase de los adolescentes a la de los adultos por la colocación de las armas” (*Amadís* 75).

When Amadís sees the opportunity to be knighted by King Perión, he has Oriana make the request on his behalf. Perión accepts and proceeds to perform the knighting ceremony:

-¿Queréis recibir orden de cavallería?

-Quiero-dixo él

-En el nombre de Dios, y Él mande que tan bien empleada en vos sea y tan crescida en honra como Él os creció en fermosura.

Y poniéndole la espuela diestra, le dixo:

-Agora sois cavallero y la espada podéis tomar.

El Rey la tomó y diógela, y el donzel la ciñó muy apuestamente. (277)

While most ceremonies can be considered a form of performance and spectacle, one can better understand Perión's role in the ceremony as "performative" if we apply Austin's concept of the performative utterance to this scene.⁷⁵ In the case of Perión, his performative utterance, "Agora sois cavallero y la espada podéis tomar" (277), is a success since it does convert Amadís into a knight, thus altering his identity forever. The successful or felicitous outcome of Perión's performance is a crucial moment in the formation of Donzel del Mar's identity as it allows him to transcend his current status and reach knighthood.

Considering that Amadís transcends to a higher social status as a knight with the help of religious and spiritual invocations, this particular ceremonial performance would appear to spring from the concept of deep play. In addition to Perión's invocation of "Dios" (277) during

⁷⁵ Referring to Austin's theory, Marvin Carlson clarifies that "In speaking a 'performative', someone does not simply make a statement...but also performs an action...Since the primary purpose of the performative is to do something rather than simply assert something, Austin suggested that its success had to be judged not on the basis of truth or falsity...but on whether the intended act was in fact successfully achieved or not" (61).

the ceremony, the reader will also find spiritual connections in Amadís' actions prior to the knighting ceremony as he spends the night in customary prayer for one about to be knighted:

Gandalín puso las armas en la capilla en tanto que la Reina cenava; y los manteles alçados, fuese el Donzel a la capilla y armóse de sus armas todas, salvo la cabeça y las manos, y hizo su oración ante el altar, rogando a Dios que assí en las armas como en aquellos mortales desseos que por su señora tenía le diesse vitoria. (276-277)

The sacred ritual, the publicly performed ceremony, and the transcendence from one status to another make Amadís' knighting ceremony a good example of a deep play performance. Of course, one should not lose sight of the fact that this sacred form of play is ultimately intended to create a well-trained warrior whose ultimate contribution to society will be his ability to manage conflict on the battlefield.

Knighting ceremonies are not the only sacred rituals publicly performed to attain transcendence in *AdG*. Trials involving magic will provide Amadís the same opportunity for a deep play experience where he can satiate his desires for transcendence.⁷⁶ Just as sacred rituals are grounded in play, so too are acts of magic. As Huizinga noted, magic can be created by play: "Play casts a spell over us; it is 'enchanting', 'captivating' (*Homo Ludens* 29), and it creates a "magic circle" (*Homo Ludens* 30). Ackerman also points to magic in her discussion of deep play: "For humans, at least, art is deliberate, compulsive, and ancient. Our earliest ancestors felt the need to create art. Through it, they touched the soul of creation. It was a sacred act, a form of magic" (54). Like other forms of deep play which "test one's limits" (Ackerman 38) and satiate

⁷⁶ In his discussion of the characters in *AdG*, González asserts that "Las artes mágicas, y su efecto sobre los aconteceres de la trama, son parte de la realidad en el *Amadís*" (839).

a, “desire for transcendence” (Ackerman 9), magic will provide Amadís the opportunity to surpass all other men in greatness.

Amadís will indeed test his “limits” and attempt to “transcend” his status when he encounters the magic arch and chamber on the Ínsola Firme, created by Apolidón, the former ruler of the land. At the request of his beloved Grímanesa, and wanting only the most worthy to one day rule the Ínsola Firme, Apolidón “hizo un arco a la entrada de una huerta, en que árboles de todas naturas había; y otrosí había en ella cuatro cámaras ricas de strana labor; y era cercada de tal forma, que ninguno a ella podía entrar sino por debaxo del arco” (660). Referring to the arch, Apolidón states:

D’aquí adelante no passarán ningún hombre ni mujer si ovieren errado aquellos que primero començaron amar; porque la imagen que vedes tañer aquella trompa con son tan spantoso, a fumo y llamas de fuego que los fará ser tollidos y assí como muertos serán deste sitio lançados. Pero si tal caballero o dueña o doncella aquí viniere, que sean dinos de acabar esta aventura por la gran lealtad suya, como ya dixe, entrarán sin ningún entrevalllo, y la imagen hará tan dulce son, que muy sabroso sea de oír a los que lo vieren, y éstos verán las nuestras imágenes y sus nombres scriptos en el jaspe, que no sepan quién los escribe. (661)

Apolidón’s magic ultimately manifests itself as artistic creations such as music, images, and writing. The magic continues beyond the arch and into the chambers as well: “Estonces se fueron donde la cámara era, y Apolidón mandó traer dos padrones, uno de piedra y otro de cobre; y el de piedra fizo poner a cinco passos de la puerta de la cámara, y el de cobre cinco más desviado” (661). Apolidón then states to Grímanesa:

Agora sabed que en esta cámara no puede hombre ni mujer entrar en ninguna manera ni tiempo, hasta que aquí venga tal caballero que de bondad de armas me passe, ni mujer, si a vos de fermosura no pasarse; pero si tales vinieren que a mí de armas y a vos de hermosura vençan, sin estorvo alguno entrarán. (661-662)

Apolidón has created “ludic” challenges, and through them, given Amadís the opportunity to perform his courage and love for Oriana. In effect, Amadís’ subsequent performance will be grounded in deep play and will thus be a form of deep performance.

When Amadís reaches the Ínsola Firme, he quickly passes through the arch, demonstrating the purity of his love: “Estonces dio su cavallo y sus armas a su scudero Gandalín y fuese adelante lo más presto que él pudo sin temor ninguno, como aquel que sentía no haver errado a su señora, no solamente por obra, mas por el pensamiento” (670). Amadís’ actions prompt the magic to begin immediately: “la imagen comenzó a hazer un son mucho más diferenciado en dulçura que a los otros hazía, y por boca de la trompa lançava flores muy hermosas” (670). After passing the test of the arch, he makes his way to the secret chambers as well:

Y luego passó adelante y sintióse herir de todas partes duramente, y llegó al padrón de mármol, y, passando dél, parecióle que todos los del mundo eran a lo ferir, y oía gran roído de bozes, como si el mundo se fundiese...Pero él, con aquella cuita, no dexava de ir adelante, cayendo a las vezes de manos y otras de rodillas, y la espada con que muchos golpes diera había perdido de la mano y andava colgada de una correa, que la no podía cobrar. (673)

Once suffering the harsh conditions of the chamber, Amadís hears a voice that states: “Bien venga el cavallero que passando de bondad aquel que este encantamiento hizo, que en su tiempo par no tuvo, será de aquí señor” (673). In other words, Amadís has won the Ínsola firme due to his public demonstrations of love, courage, and physical endurance. He has “tested his limits” and “transcended” other mortal men to become the rightful heir to the Ínsola Firme. He is quickly applauded by the inhabitants of the land: “A esta razón, todos los del Castillo, que las bozes oyeran de cómo le otorgavan el señorío y le vieron dentro, començaron a decir en alta boz: -Señor, havemos cumplido, a Dios loor, [lo] que tanto deseado teníamos” (673). As in all of his other public performances, Amadís’ receives public acclaim for his actions. Unlike his usual victories, Amadís has triumphed over magical obstacles in the arch and chamber. Given magic’s connections to the sacred and to play in general, once can consider Amadís’ actions to be grounded in a form of deep play, thus making his victory a “deep” performance.

Amadís’ activities can be described as a deep performance once again when he battles the creature known as Endriago on the Ínsola “del Diablo” (1130). In plain sight of Gandalín, Amadís, disguised as the Cavallero de la Verde Spada, valiantly heads toward danger, exhibiting his courage and strength: “El Diablo, como lo vido, vino luego para él, y echo un fuego por la boca con un humo tan negro, que apenas se podían ver el uno al otro. Y el de la Verde Spada se metió por el humo adelante, y llegando cerca dél, le encontró con la lança por muy gran dicha en el un ojo, así que gelo quebró” (1143). Considering the name of the island and the creature, the episode clearly has religious connections. According to González:

Los sufrimientos de Amadís y su delirio agonizante después de la batalla sirven para recordarle una vez más que su poder depende sólo de la Divinidad, de su carácter de

instrumento del Señor. La aventura exalta al héroe, pero su propósito ulterior es revelar que el Señor permite que los hombres ejecuten su voluntad. (851)

In other words, this episode is ultimately connected to the sacred, which in turn is connected to the ludic. As previously stated, Huizinga saw strong connections between the sacred and the ludic, explaining that “Holiness and play always tend to overlap” (*Homo Ludens* 163). He saw no inconsistency in conflating the two, referring to the “Platonic identification of play and holiness” (*Homo Ludens* 33) as a justification for his assertions:

The Platonic identification of play and holiness does not defile the latter by calling it play, rather it exalts the concept of play to the highest regions of the spirit...In play we may move below the level of serious, as the child does; but we can also move above it-in the realm of the beautiful and the sacred. (*Homo Ludens* 38).

If Amadis’ confrontation with Endriago has any religious overtones to it as suggested by González (851), then at the same time, there would axiomatically be ludic overtones as well due to the Platonic concept of sacred play which can be found in religious experiences. Seen from a religious perspective, the defeat of the evil monster would certainly be a “transcendental” event for Amadís, which would imply that if play were present based on the element of the sacred, it would most likely be deep play.

Cacho Blecua acknowledges the religious aspect of the battle by calling it “la lucha contra las fuerzas demoníacas del Endriago” (*Amadís* 280), but he also suggests further psychoanalytical interpretations by stating that with his victory over Endriago, Amadís “se emancipa tanto del mundo Materno como del Paterno” (*Amadís* 281), and goes on to call the episode “un evento transpersonal” (*Amadís* 282). Even from the psychoanalytical perspective,

Amadís would appear to be engaged in “risk taking,” testing his “limits,” and fulfilling his “desire for transcendence” (Ackerman 12; 38; 9), thus once again connecting his actions to deep play. Whether participating in a knighting ceremony, battling magical obstacles, or confronting monsters, Amadís engages in activity grounded in deep play, thus making several moments throughout the text deep performances.

The present chapter has explored the ludic origins of several conflict-oriented performances found throughout *AdG*. Relying on the ideas of performance theorists like Schechner who see performance as play, the chapter proposed that chivalric performances in *AdG* were ultimately ludic activities. In addition to presenting the performances themselves as a type of play, my analysis further contextualized those performative moments in the text, assigning each one to a specific category of play. Those categories included secretive play, competitive play, and deep play. Relying on Caillois and Schechner, the analysis revealed that secretive performances contained the potential for dark play, providing the performer with secretive moments of gratification caused by his or her disguised activity. Likewise, an application of Huizinga’s views on the ludic nature of contests demonstrated that many competitive performances in *AdG* draw inspiration from organized games and other activities with ludic foundations. Finally, the analysis explored the moments of what Diane Ackerman refers to as “deep play”, showing how several key performances in the text grow from play’s connection to the sacred and mankind’s “desire for transcendence” (9). Though varied in nature, each of these categories is based on the ludic concept of play.

With play at the very core of *AdG*, this Chivalric text would thus find close affinity with the *novelas sentimentales*, which this dissertation has argued are fundamentally ludic texts. The relationship between Ardanlyer and Lyessa in *Sla* was marked by both sexual play and sacred

play, both elements which spur Amadís into action. In *GyG*, and *Cda*, the protagonists will rely on competitive behavior to achieve their goals. Grimalte's competitive streak will send him half-way around the world in pursuit of Pánfilo, while Leriano and Laureola compete in a much more complex game of strategy. Likewise, Amadís' existence would seem to center on both organized and spontaneous competition, which he relies upon to construct his very identity. And while characters like Grimalte, Pánfilo, and even the Auctor will rely on brief moments of mimicry and secretive performance to achieve their goals, Amadís will take this to the next level by disguising himself several times to do the same. In summary, though different, each of the texts presented throughout this dissertation have elements of play and conflict at their very core, driving the evolution of both characters and plot. Like the *novelas sentimentales* discussed in previous chapters of this dissertation, *AdG* too is a ludic text.

However, unlike the *novelas sentimentales*, whose ludic activities ultimately caused the downfall of the characters and thus prompted my proposal that they were, in fact, a form of *reprobatio ludī*, my analysis of *AdG* suggests that Amadís' ludic activities were well worth the effort when one considers the pleasant ending provided by Rodríguez de Montalvo. As stated in the introduction to this chapter, the primitive version of *Amadís* did not end quite so well for the protagonist. Originally, it would seem that medieval readers saw all of Amadís' ludic activity lead to his demise. This, of course, would place earlier versions of *AdG* more closely in line with the *novelas sentimentales* presented throughout this dissertation as a form of warning against the excesses of play. However, Avalle-Arce explains that the death and destruction at the end of the primitive version "is completely out of place at a time when courtly love has gained sway over the ruling class of the nation as a whole" (14). Avalle-Arce also cites a letter by the Venetian humanist Andrea Navagero who witnessed the exceptional performances of soldiers in the battle

of Granada who were inspired by Courtly Love (13-14). In a time when performance on the battlefield could be increased by Courtly Love, it makes sense for Rodríguez de Montalvo to cast the effects of Courtly Love in a more positive light. As Avalle-Arce states, “the murderous, violent passion of love as portrayed in the last actions of the original *Amadís de Gaula* had to change” (14). Regardless of the fact that Rodríguez de Montalvo altered the original ending to fit the needs of late fifteenth-century politics and war, the fact remains that *AdG* is still a text strongly grounded in play due to the various types of performances demonstrated throughout this chapter. For this reason, *AdG*, like the *novelas sentimentales* is still a ludic text. While the dire warnings about excessive play may be missing at the conclusion of *AdG*, the fundamentally ludic nature of the moments of conflict throughout the text cannot be erased.

Conclusion

The thesis at the heart of this dissertation is that the special relationship between play and conflict constitutes the very core of four texts written in fifteenth-century Iberia. Unlike most current discussions about these texts, which tend to focus on genre classification, style, or other formalized divisions, the current approach has established an overarching connection throughout these works, which can account for both their similarities and differences, through recognition of the ludic. As Sutton-Smith explains, the use of play to discuss conflict may be “anathema to many modern progress-and leisure-oriented play theorists” and viewing such ludic behavior in terms of conflict can be considered an “ancient” rhetoric (10). By examining the play/conflict amalgamation as its own phenomenon, my analysis has attempted to move the discussion about these four fifteenth-century texts away from modern divisions about suffering, comedy, or genre classification, and instead refocus the discussion from a medieval perspective, which may have more readily accepted how both conflict and play jointly make up the foundations of these texts.

Relying on a variety of theories and approaches which see play as multi-faceted and complex, each of the preceding chapters highlighted how its union with conflict is a key foundational element in plot creation, character interaction, and authorial messaging in *Sla*, *GyG*, *Cda*, and *AdG*. Acknowledging the ludic underpinnings of the tension and conflict found in each of these fictional texts is a crucial step toward more fully contextualizing these works within

their late medieval environment. As noted throughout this project, Johan Huizinga has asserted that the later Middle Ages were a time when the dual manifestation of conflict and play was not only possible, but characteristic of the historical moment:

So intense and colorful was life that it could stand the mingling of the smell of blood and roses. Between hellish fears and the most childish jokes, between cruel harshness and sentimental sympathy the people stagger- like a giant with the head of a child, hither and thither. Between the absolute denial of all worldly joys and a frantic yearning for wealth and pleasure, between dark hatred and merry conviviality, they live in extremes. (*The Autumn* 24)

Huizinga's idea of living in "extremes" is easily applicable to existing scholarship's views on Sentimental and Chivalric fiction. Scholars have observed how Courtly Love in the Sentimental genre can produce intense moments of "conflict and tension" (Deyermond 163), while others focus on moments of pleasure, gratification, and in some cases, comedy and parody. Likewise, Chivalric fiction is clearly marked by its intense battle scenes, and yet, love, merriment, and pleasure can also be found throughout its pages. While the thematic "extremes" in these works such as war and peace, hatred and love, or angst and joy have often been analyzed and contextualized in isolation, the current study has moved beyond such divisions in order to understand how the harsh, intense, and conflictive elements in these texts are actually supported by and forged within the play concept.

An important point made by Huizinga and others, and stressed throughout this dissertation, is that while play may distinguish itself from conflict, and in some cases may stand as a counterbalance to it in certain circumstances, play and conflict should by no means be seen

as two polar opposites in every context. Instead, like Huizinga's recently mentioned child/giant hybrid shifting between pain and pleasure, play and conflict are both intertwined and interdependent, difficult to distinguish and separate as neatly as one may suspect. The metaphorical giant's tendency to move toward two paths simultaneously, as well as his physical description of being half giant/half child, exemplifies how two seemingly disparate notions combine together in the same phenomenon. This coming together of play and conflict can be seen most clearly in Huizinga's view of war as an extended game metaphor (*Homo ludens* 110) and Sutton-Smith's discussion of the "rhetoric of play as power" (10), which describes how the language of play is often used as "a representation of conflict and as a way to fortify the status of those who control the play or are its heroes" (10). One need only refer to the extravagant tournaments and festivities of Juan II or Miguel Lucas de Iranzo, discussed in the introduction of this dissertation, to see that play, conflict, and of course, power, can easily intersect in daily medieval Iberian life.

Approaching each text through the lens of play/conflict places us more closely to the medieval world described by Huizinga; a world in which "swordplay" between knights was considered "play and exercise" (Huizinga, *Autumn* 89), and the "life of love" was turned "into a beautiful play with noble rules" (Huizinga, *Autumn* 128). However, it is not only Huizinga, but medieval man himself who saw daily life in terms of play and games. In chapter three's analysis of *Cda*, I discussed Jenny Adams' *Power Play: The Literature and Politics of Chess in the Late Middle Ages*, in which she asserts that medieval culture utilized the chess metaphor to describe itself: "That medieval culture *wanted* to see itself in the game is most indicative in the changes Western players and writers made to the pieces and the rules" (2). The first treatise to elaborate on some of the new rules to which Adams refers was Luis de Lucena's *Arte de ajedrez con CL*

juego de partido, produced on the Iberian Peninsula during the reign of Isabel and Fernando in 1497. Barbara Weissberger's analysis of Lucena's work even suggested that the new rules for chess could be directly attributable to Isabel's powerful position (*Isabel* 153). Whether or not specific rule changes can be attributed to Isabel de Castilla, the larger point to be made here is that medieval culture would seem to draw a direct correlation between game-play and society, and medieval Iberia was not an exception.

Connecting daily life at Trastamaran Courts with the concept of play also entered into each chapter of my analysis by highlighting Juan II's interest in play and games, as well as Isabel and Fernando's predilection for ludic activities. Macpherson has described how Isabel de Castilla's court staged elaborate tournaments, games, and after-dinner literary reunions (101), and Michael asserts that her "chief entertainments" involved "dancing and singing as well as taking part in family masques" (109). Given the ludic atmosphere present at Castilian Courts, combined with the frequent conflict between nobles described by José Manuel Nieto Soria, it becomes clear that Medieval Iberia was not exempt from this tendency to easily overlap play and conflict. Therefore, it is worth considering that the play/conflict phenomenon, which seemed to appear so readily throughout the fifteenth-century, would be a major influence on the literature of the time. Recognizing play and conflict as two pillars fused together and supporting the foundation of Sentimental and Chivalric fiction will help to situate these works within fifteenth-century Iberian reality, which saw kings and queens engaging in their own back and forth between moments of play and conflict-oriented scenarios.

Drawing from the reality of the world around them, the fifteenth-century Iberian authors included in this dissertation relied upon a combination of both play and conflict to construct their plots and character interaction, and therefore their works ultimately appear to deliver a message

about the value of the dual play/conflict phenomenon itself. While Rodríguez del Padrón, Flores, and San Pedro would seem to caution the reader about the dangers of mixing play and conflict, evidenced by the eventual deaths of their protagonists, Montalvo appears more accepting of this dual reality, allowing for a felicitous outcome despite the apparent dangers that combining play and conflict can create.

Chapter one discussed Juan Rodríguez del Padrón's extensive and eclectic use of the play/conflict amalgamation in *Sla*. Rodríguez del Padrón relied on four core components for the creation of his work: allegory, poetry, myth, and strategy. These core components, due to their strong ties to play, form what I have labeled the four ludic pillars of the text. Rodríguez del Padrón uses each of these play-inspired elements to construct his narrative and to facilitate interaction between characters. In each case, his use of these four ludic pillars ultimately highlights the conflictive and overwhelming nature of Courtly Love, thus showing how seamlessly both play and conflict blend together and rely upon one another. Rodríguez del Padrón's use of ludic elements to construct a text about and warn against the dangers of Courtly Love, an activity which itself has been seen as a form of game between lovers, may suggest the need to re-categorize the work under the heading of ludic fiction to more accurately reflect its playful origins and purposes.

My analysis of play and conflict continued in chapter two with the examination of Juan de Flores' *GyG*. Relying on Michael J. Apter's modified Reversal Theory, my investigation demonstrated how several moments in the text had the ability to provoke playful/pleasurable experiences for readers while simultaneously causing serious, and angst-filled emotions for characters. The ability to simultaneously provide playful and conflictive experiences for readers and characters reveals that Flores, like Rodríguez del Padrón before him, relied upon the special

link between play and conflict in the creation of his work. Similar to Rodríguez del Padrón, Flores also takes advantage of the play/conflict bond to deliver his ultimate warnings against the dangers of Courtly Love play. Furthermore, drawing from Roger Caillois' game categories, I underscored the fact that character behavior and interaction in the text find strong affinity with various types of games, further revealing the text's playful tendencies and affiliation with the ludic fiction category.

Chapter three extended my analysis of play and conflict in the Sentimental sub-genre by focusing on Diego de San Pedro's *Cda*. An application of modern-day Game Theory, first introduced in chapter one, revealed that *Cda*'s plot is nearly completely dominated by conflictive and strategic character interaction, likening it to a game of chess where planning and maneuvering against an opponent are the surest ways to win. Having established that Game Theory recognizes two types of games, total conflict and partial conflict in nature, my analysis concluded that most characters acted as though rational players, but that they often engaged in, or were tricked into playing, the wrong type of game altogether. The majority of the tragedy and angst so identified with the characters of this novel is due, in large part, to the confusion about the true type of game in which characters are participating. Considering the text's strategic game-like qualities and San Pedro's apparent condemnation of Courtly Love games, the text easily fits into my proposed ludic fiction classification.

While chapter three showcased the game-like nature of strategic psychological contests between characters, chapter four focused on Garci Rodríguez de Montalvo's *AdG*, especially the physical conflicts between knights, revealing how such chivalric performances are shaped by the ludic. Relying on theories about play and performance, my examination delineated three specific play-inspired performance categories, which illustrated the ludic underpinnings of knightly

behavior in the text. Unlike the previous works discussed in this dissertation, the felicitous outcome of *AdG* would seem to imply Montalvo's approbation of such ludic-inspired activity. However, I also presented alternative possibilities by reminding the reader about earlier versions of the text, which saw such playful behavior lead to the downfall of the hero. Additionally, even Montalvo's version is replete with ludic-inspired knightly behavior causing near tragic moments which are conveniently averted time and again. Regardless of Montalvo's stance on the benefits or dangers of the play/conflict phenomenon, he clearly relies on this dual reality to construct his work. For this reason, *AdG*, like the texts in previous chapters, fits well in a ludic fiction category.

Each of the works analyzed in this dissertation are centered on the notion of conflict. The vast majority of confrontations are connected to the Game of Courtly Love. Some characters pursue love, others attempt to flee from it, and even those not directly involved in the amorous relationships are affected by its very presence. This last group of characters that are not the actual lovers tend to be drawn in for a variety of reasons such as pity, anger, greed, jealousy or even honor and friendship. These motivations can also spur conflict even when Courtly Love is not present in a given situation, particularly when knightly battles are involved. While there is a multitude of reasons why characters may engage in conflictive behavior, there is a consistent presence of play in these scenarios, whether overt or just under the surface. The preceding chapters have shown how a poetic exchange of harsh words, strategic positioning against an opponent, and even full-scale battles have deep connections to the concept of play. Many attempts to analyze the preceding texts have pointed out fascinating tendencies and important meaning in these works. And yet, the idea of play, conflict's silent companion, is often forgotten or overlooked. Even when playful concepts are mentioned in connection to these texts they are

normally presented in terms of the “modern progress-and leisure-oriented” approaches mentioned by Sutton-Smith (110), focusing on the comical or light-hearted intentions of the authors. Recognizing play’s complex nature, and the fact that it can range from being serious, funny, or even spiritual, will help to elevate the play concept to its proper place in the discussion of these texts. Acknowledging play’s integral role in the conflict scenarios within these works in no way diminishes the existing scholarship on these texts, but rather brings to light a deeper and richer understanding of each of them.

Admittedly, play is much more difficult to define than conflict. A reader hardly needs much proof that an argument or battle can be considered a conflict scenario. Play, on the other hand, is malleable and can manifest itself in a variety of forms and circumstances. It can easily appear in a child’s game one moment and be entangled in the rules of war in the next. It is “elusive” as Spariosu (“Literature” k1) points out. I contend that this “elusive” nature is a primary reason why existing scholarship has not more readily accepted play’s fundamental role in these four fifteenth-century texts. When one combines the quiet flexibility of play with the overt nature of knightly battles, or the dramatic cries of a courtly lover, it is easy to see how play’s fundamental role in these texts can be overlooked. And yet, to ignore play’s relationship with conflict is to ignore the medieval world which Huizinga so vividly described.

Approaching these texts as being forged in both conflict and play not only more accurately accounts for the numerous similarities and differences, but also contextualizes these works in their late medieval milieu. Furthermore, this approach also opens up new avenues of inquiry into literary production in medieval and Early Modern Iberia. Having established the strong presence of the play/conflict phenomenon in these texts, one can begin to trace the origins and evolution of this phenomenon both chronologically and across genres. If we are to look at

these texts as cultural artifacts, reflective of their time and place of composition, then the pervasive presence of the play/conflict relationship in these four works does accurately reflect what we know about fifteenth-century Castilian nobility; that they lived in a world where conflict was as common as the tournaments and festivals in which they participated, and that the play/conflict phenomenon was a harsh ludic reality with which nearly all nobles had to contend.

Works Cited

- Abt, Clark C. *Serious Games*. New York: The Viking Press, 1970.
- Ackerman, Diane. *Deep play*. New York: Random House, 1999.
- Adams, Jenny. *Power Play: The Literature and Politics of Chess in the Late Middle Ages*. Philadelphia: U of P Press, 2006.
- Albuxech, Lourdes. "Utopía y distopía en tres ficciones de Juan de Flores." *Romania* 120.1-2 (2002): 176-91.
- Andrachuk, Gregory Peter. "A Re-examination of the poetry of Juan Rodríguez del Padrón." *BHS* 57 (1980): 299-308.
- . "Prosa y poesía en el *Siervo libre de amor*." *Actas del sexto congreso internacional de hispanistas*. Toronto: Asociación Internacional de hispanistas, 1977. 60-2.
- . "The Function of the *Estoria de dos amadores* within the *Siervo libre de amor*." *Revista Canadiense de Estudios Hispánicos* 2.1 (1977): 27-38.
- Apter, Michael J. "A Structural-Phenomenology of Play." *Adult Play*. Eds. John H. Kerr and Michael J. Apter. Amsterdam: Swetz and Zeitlinger, 1990. 13-30.
- Ara, Jesús A. "Sobre el texto de dos poemas del «Siervo libre de amor»." *Bulletin Hispanique* 78.3-4 (1976): 219-225.
- Austin, J.L. "How to do things with words:lecture II." *The Performance Studies Reader*.

Ed. Henry Bial. New York: Routledge, 2004. 177-183.

Avalle-Arce. Juan Bautista. "The Primitive Version of *Amadís de Gaula*." *Acta* 8 (1984): 1-22.

Babich, Babette E. "Nietzsche's 'Artists' Metaphysics' and Fink's Ontological 'World Play'"

International Studies in Philosophy 37.3 (2005): 163-180.

Barber, Richard. *The Knight and Chivalry*. Suffolk: Boydell, 1995.

Bateson, Gregory. "A Theory of Play and Fantasy." *Ritual, Play, and Performance: Readings*

in The Social Sciences/Theatre. Ed. Richard Schechner and Mady Schuman. New York:

The Seabury Press, 1976. 67-73.

Beaujour, Michel. "The Game of Poetics." *Game, Play, Literature*. Ed. Jacques Ehrman. Boston:

Beacon Press, 1971. 58-67.

Beck, Emily S. *Waging War with Words: Idealized Gender and Iberian Chivalry*. Diss.

Columbia U, 2008. Ann Arbor: UMI, 2008.

Besó Portalés, César. "El sentimiento amoroso en la *Cárcel de amor*." *Espéculo* 21 (2002): 1-14.

Bial, Henry. *The Performance Studies Reader*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Blay Manzanera, Vicenta. "La convergencia de lo caballeresco y lo sentimental en los siglos

XV y XVI." *Literatura de caballerías y orígenes de la novela*. Ed. Rafael Beltrán.

Valencia: U de Valencia, 1998. 259-287.

Boase, Roger. *The Origin and Meaning of Courtly Love: A Critical Study of European Scholarship*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 1977.

Bohman-Kalaja. *Reading Games: An Aesthetics of Play in Flann O'Brien, Samuel Beckett and Georges Perec*. Urbana Champaign: Dalkey Archive P, 2007.

Brams, Steven J. *Biblical Games: A Strategic Analysis of Stories in the Old Testament*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1980.

--- "Game Theory and Literature." *Journal of Economic Literature* 026 (1994): 32-54.

Bretherton, Inge. "Representing the Social World in Symbolic Play: Reality and Fantasy."

Symbolic Play: The Development of Social Understanding. Ed. Inge Bretherton.

Orlando: Academic Press, 1984.1-41.

Brownlee, Marina Scordilis. "The Counterfeit Muse: Ovid, Boccaccio, Juan de Flores."

Discourses of Authority in Medieval and Renaissance Literature (1989): 109-27.

---. "The Generic Status of The *Siervo libre de amor*: Rodríguez del

Padrón's Reworking of Dante." *Poetics Today* 5.3 (1984): 629-643.

Bukowska, Joanna. "Theatricality of the Chivalric World in Thomas Malory's *Le Morte*

D'Arthur." *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies* 3.1-2 (2002): 33-44.

Cacho Blecua, Juan Manuel. *Amadís: Heroísmo mítico y cortesano*. Madrid: Cupsa, 1979.

Caillois, Roger. *Man, Play, and Games*. Tran. Meyer Barash. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.

Carlson, Marvin. *Performance: A Critical Introduction*. New York: Routledge, 1996.

Cocozzella, Peter. "The Thematic Unity of Juan Rodríguez del Padrón's *Siervo libre de amor*." *Hispania* 64.2 (1981): 188-198.

Coulson, Andrew S. "Cognitive Synergy in Televised Entertainment." *Adult Play*. Ed. John H. Kerr and Michael J. Apter. Amsterdam: Swetz and Zeitlinger, 1990. 71-86.

Crane, Susan. *The Performance of Self: Ritual, Clothing, and Identity during the Hundred Year's War*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2002.

Cull, John T. "Irony, Romance Conventions, and Misogyny in *Grisel y Mirabella* by Juan de Flores." *Revista canadiense de estudios hispánicos* 22.3 (1998): 415-30.

De Ley, Herbert. "The Name of the Game: Applying Game Theory in Literature." *SubStance* 17.1 (1988): 33-46.

Deegan, James G. and Anthony D. Pellegrini. "Play and Linking Trajectories for Social Origins of Cognition." *The Play of the Self*. Ed. Ronald Bogue and Mihai I. Spariosu. Albany: State U of New York P, 1994. 113-135.

Delgado León, Feliciano. *La coronación de Juan de Mena: Edición, estudio, comentario*.

Córdoba: Publicaciones del Monte de Piedad y Caja de Ahorros de Córdoba, 1978.

DeLong, Audrey Jennifer. *Chivalry and the Crusades. Martial Masculinity in Post-Crusade Literature*. Diss. U of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2003. Ann Arbor: UMI, 2004.

Deyermond, A.D. "The Lost Genre of Medieval Spanish Literature." *Hispanic Review* 43.3 (1975): 231-259.

Diccionario de la lengua española. Real Academia Española. Web 03/14/2014.

Ducharme, Lori J. and Gary Alan Fine. "No Escaping Obligation: Erving Goffman on the Demands and Constraints of Play." *The Play of the Self*. Ed. Ronald Bogue and Mihai I. Spariosu. Albany: State U of New York P, 1994. 89-112.

Echeruo, Michael J. C. "Redefining the Ludic: Mimesis, Expression, and the Festival Mode." *The Play of the Self*. Ed. Ronald Bogue and Mihai I. Spariosu. Albany: State U of New York P, 1994. 137-156.

Ehrman, Jacques. "*Homo Ludens* Revisited." *Game, Play, Literature*. Ed. Jacques Ehrman. Boston: Beacon Press, 1971. 31-57.

Evreinoff, Nicolas. *The Theatre in Life*. Alexander I. Nazaroff, ed. New York: Brentano's, 1927.

Fallows, Noel. *Jousting in Medieval and Renaissance Iberia*. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2010.

Fink, Eugen. "The Oasis of Happiness: Toward an Ontology of Play." *Yale French Studies*

40.1 (1968):19-30.

Flores, Juan de. *Grimalte y Gradissa*. Ed. Pamela Waley. London: Tamesis, 1971.

Folger, Robert. *Escape From The Prison of Love: Caloric Identities and Writing Subjects in*

Fifteenth-Century Spain. Chapel Hill: North Carolina Studies in the Romance Languages

and Literatures U.N. C. Department of Romance Languages, 2009.

---. "Memoria en *Siervo libre de amor*: el papel de la psicología medieval en la ficción

sentimental." *La corónica* 26.2 (1998):197-210.

Foust, R. E. "Poetics, Play, and Literary Fantasy." *The New Orleans Review* 9.3 (1982): 40-44.

Francomano, Emily C. "'Puse un sobrescripto' [I Wrote a New Cover]: Manuscripts, Print,

and the Material Epistolary of '*Cárcel de amor*'" *Fifteenth-Century Studies* 36 (2011):

25-48.

Frey, Kurt P. "Sexual Behaviour as Adult Play." *Adult Play: A Reversal Theory Approach*. Ed.

John H. Kerr and Michael J. Apter. Amsterdam: Swetz and Zeitlinger, 1990. 55-69.

Gascón Vera, Elena. "El concepto de la tragedia en los escritos cultos de la corte de Juan II."

Actas del sexto congreso internación de hispanistas. Toronto: Asociación Internacional

de hispanistas, 1977. 305-307.

Gastañaga-Ponce de León, José-Luis. "Diego de San Pedro y el descontento en la corte de los

Reyes Católicos. Una lectura de *Cárcel de amor*.” *BHS* 85 (2008): 809-820.

Gerli, E. Michael. “*Studies of the Spanish Sentimental Romance (1440-1550)*:

Redefining a Genre. Ed. Joseph J. Gwara and E. Michael Gerli. London: Tamesis, 1997.

---. *Poesía cancioneril*. Madrid: Ediciones Akal, 1994.

---. “‘Señora, fablar querría mas he miedo de errar.’ Signs, Sense, and Courtly Culture: On

Marina Brownlee’s *The Severed Word*.” *Journal of Hispanic Philology* 15.3 (1991):

237-249.

Giffin, Holly. “The Coordination of Meaning in the Creation of a Shared Make-Believe Reality.”

Symbolic Play: The Development of Social Understanding. Ed. Inge Bretherton.

Orlando: Academic Press, 1984. 73-100.

Gil-Albarellos, Susana. *Amadís de Gaula y el género caballeresco en España*. Valladolid:

Universidad de Valladolid, 1999.

Goffman, Erving. *Encounters: Two Studies in the Sociology of Interaction*. Indianapolis: The

Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1961.

---. “Performances: Belief in the Part one is Playing.” *The Performance Studies Reader*. Ed.

Henry Bial. New York: Routledge, 2004. 61-65.

---. *Strategic Interaction*. Philadelphia, U of P Press, 1969.

--- *The Presentation of the Self in Everyday Life*. New York: Overlook Press,
1973.

González, Elroy R. "Tipología de los personajes en el Amadís de Gaula." *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 39.2 (1991): 825-864.

Gwara, Joseph J. "Observations on the Text of *Grimalte y Gradissa*." *Romance Philology* 56 (2003): 245-91.

---. "The Identity of Juan de Flores: The Evidence of the *Crónica incompleta de los Reyes Católicos*." *Journal of Hispanic Philology* 11.2 (1987): 103-130.

Haywood, Louise M. "'La escura selva': Allegory in Early Sentimental Romance." *Hispanic Review* 68.4 (2000): 415-428.

---. "Lyric and Other Verse Insertions in Sentimental Romances." *Studies on The Spanish Sentimental Romance (1440-1550): Redefining a Genre*. Ed. Joseph J. Gwara and E. Michael Gerli. London: Tamesis, 1997. 191-206.

---. "Reading Song in Sentimental Romance: A Case Study of Juan de Flores's *Grimalte y Gradissa*." *La corónica* 29.1 (2000): 129-146.

Herrero, Javier. "The Allegorical Structure of the *Siervo libre de amor*." *Speculum* 55.4 (1980): 751-764.

Huizinga, Johan. *Homo Ludens: A Study of the Play Element in Culture*. London: Temple Smith, 1970.

---. *The Autumn of the Middle Ages*. Trans. Rodney J. Payton and Ulrich Mammitzch, Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1996.

Hutchinson, Peter. *Games Authors Play*. London: Methuen, 1983.

Ihrie, Maureen. "Discourses of Power in The *Cárcel de Amor*." *Hispanofila* 125 (1999): 1-10.

Jaeger, C. Stephen. *The Origins of Courtliness*. Philadelphia: U of P Press, 1985.

Kamen, Henry. *Spain 1469-1714: A Society of Conflict*. Harlow: Pearson Longman, 2005.

Kendrick, Laura. "Games Medievalists Play: How to Make Earnest of Game and Still Enjoy it." *New Literary History* 40.1 (2009): 43-61.

---. *The Game of Love: Troubadour Wordplay*. Berkley: U of C Press, 1988.

Kerr, John. H. "'A Structural Phenomenology of Play' in Context." *Adult Play*. Ed. John H.

Kerr and Michael J. Apter. Amsterdam: Swetz and Zeitlinger, 1990. 31-42.

Lacarra, María Eugenia. "Juan de Flores y la ficción sentimental." *Actas del IX Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas* Frankfurt: Vervuert, 1989. 223-33.

Lacarra Lanz, Eukene. "Siervo libre de amor, ¿autobiografía espiritual?" *La corónica* 29.1 (2000): 147-170.

Langbehn-Rohland, Regula. "Un mundo al revés: La mujer en las obras de ficción de Juan de

Flores." *Studies on the Spanish Sentimental Romance (1440-1550): Redefining a Genre*.

Ed. Joseph J. Gwara and E. Michael Gerli. London: Tamesis, 1997.

Lastra Paz, Silvia. "Los procedimientos juridico-deliberativos en el *Amadís de Gaula*."

Letras 48-49 (2003): 151-58.

Lieberman, J. Nina. *Playfulness: Its Relationship to Imagination and Creativity*. New York:

Academic Press, 1977.

Macpherson, Ian. "The Game of Courtly Love: *Letra*, *Divisa*, and *Invención* at the Court of the

Catholic Monarchs." *Poetry at Court in Trastamaran Spain: From the Cancionero de*

Baena to the Cancionero General. Ed. E. Michael Gerli and Julian Weiss. Tempe:

Arizona State U, 1998. 95-110.

Mallorquí Rusalleda, Enric. "Economía y juego en *Celestina*." *Neophilologus* 94 (2010):

595-611.

Márquez Villanueva, Francisco. "*Cárcel de amor*, novela política." *Revista de Occidente* 14

(1966): 185-200.

Martín, Oscar. "Allegory and the Spaces of Love." *Diacritics* 36.3-4 (2006): 132-146.

Mazzotta, Giuseppe. *The World at Play in Boccaccio's Decameron*. Princeton: Princeton UP,

1986.

Menéndez Collera, Ana. "La poesía cancioneril de entretenimiento en la Corte de los Reyes

Católicos: El 'Juego trovado' de Pinar." *Estudios en homenaje a Enrique Ruiz Fornells*

(1990): 425-31.

Michael, Ian. "'From Her Shall Read the Perfect Ways of Honour': Isabel of Castile and

Chivalric Romance." *BHS Special Edition The Age of the Catholic Monarchs,*

1474-1516: Literary Studies in Memory of Keith Whinnom. Alan Deyermond and

Ian Macpherson, eds. (1989): 103-112.

Miller, David L. *Gods and Games: Toward a Theology of Play*. New York: The World

Publishing Company, 1970.

Montalvo, Garci Rodríguez de. *Amadís de Gaula*. Ed. Juan Manuel Cacho Blecua. Madrid:

Cátedra, 2001.

Munjic, Sanda. "Leriano's Suffering Subjectivity; or, the Politics of Sentimentality in *Cárcel de*

amor." *Revista Canadiense de estudios hispánicos* 32.2 (2008): 203-226.

Nelson, Katherine and Susan Seidman. "Playing with Scripts." *Symbolic Play: The Development*

of Social Understanding. Ed. Inge Bretherton. Orlando: Academic Press, 1984. 45-72.

Nepaulsingh, Colbert I. *Towards a History of Literary Composition in Medieval Spain*. Toronto:

U of Toronto P, 1986.

Nieto Soria, José Manuel. *El conflicto en escenas: La pugna política como representación en la Castilla bajomedieval*. Dir. José Manuel Nieto Soria. Madrid: Silex, 2010.

---. *Orígenes de la monarquía hispánica: propaganda y legitimación (1400-1520)*. Madrid:

Dykinson, 1999.

O'Callaghan, Joseph F. *A History of Medieval Spain*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1975.

Orduna, Lilia E. F. de. "Amadís de Gaula." *Siete siglos de autores españoles*. Ed. Kurt and Theo

Reichenberger. Germany: Kassel, 1991.

Otero, Ellan B. *The Fiction of the 'Rime': Gaspara Stampa's 'Poetic Misprision' of Giovanni*

Boccacio's 'The Elegy of Lady Fiammetta'. Diss. U of South Florida, 2011. Ann Arbor:

UMI, 2011.

Pérez de Guzmán, Fernán. *Crónicas de los reyes de Castilla*. Madrid: M. Rivadeneyra, 1877.

---. *Pen Portraits of Illustrious Castilians*. Trans. Marie Gillette and Loretta Zehngut.

Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America P, 2003.

Pinet, Simone. "The Knight, the Kings, and the Tapestries: The Amadís Series." *Revista*

Canadiense de estudios hispánicos 30 (2006): 537-554.

Riquer, Martín de. *Estudios sobre el Amadís de Gaula*. Barcelona: Sirmio, 1987.

- Rivas Hernández, Ascensión. "Juegos de ficción y realidad en el *Breve Tractado de Grimalte y Gradissa*." *Humanismo y literatura en tiempos de Juan del Encina*. Ed. Javier Guijarro Ceballos. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad, 1999.
- Rivera-Cordero, Victoria. "Enfermedad, creación poética y autoconciencia en *Siervo libre de Amor*." *La corónica* 35.2 (2007): 273-289.
- Rodríguez del Padrón, Juan. *Siervo libre de amor*. Ed. Antonio Prieto. Madrid: Clásicos Castalia, 1986.
- Rohland de Langbehn, Regula. "Argumentación y poesía: Función de las partes integradas en el relato de la novela sentimental española de los siglos XV y XVI." *Actas del IX Congreso de la Asociación Internacional de Hispanistas*. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert, 1989. 575-82.
- Ruiz, Teofilo F. "Elite and Popular Culture in Late Fifteenth-Century Castilian Festivals: The Case of Jaén." *City and Spectacle in Medieval Europe*. Ed. Barbara A. Hanawalt and Kathryn L. Reyerson. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1994.
- *Spain's Centuries of Crisis: 1300-1474*. Malden: Blackwell, 2007.
- Ruiz García, Elisa. *Los libros de Isabel la Católica: arqueología de un patrimonio escrito*. Salamanca: Instituto de Historia del libro y de la lectura, 2004.

San Pedro, Deigo de. *Cárcel de amor*. Ed. José Francisco Ruiz Casanova. Madrid: Cátedra, 2005.

Schechner, Richard. "Playing." *Play and Culture* 1 (1988): 3-19.

Schelling, Thomas C. *Strategy of Conflict*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1960.

Severin, Dorothy Sherman. *Religious Parody and the Spanish Sentimental Romance*. Newark: Juan de la Cuesta, 2005.

---"The Sentimental Genre: Romance, Novel, or Parody?" *La corónica* 31.2 (2003): 312-315.

Shubik, Martin. *Game Theory and Related Approaches to Social Behavior: Selections*. Ed. Martin Shubik. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

Sieber, Harry. "The Romance of Chivalry in Spain: From Rodríguez de Montalvo to Cervantes." *Romance: Generic Transformation from Chrétien de Troyes to Cervantes*. Ed. Kevin Brownlee and Marina Scordilis Brownlee. Hanover: UP of New England, 1985.

Spariosu, Mihai. "Literature and Play: A socio-Cultural Approach." *Degres* 32 (1982): k1-k11.

Sutton-Smith, Brian. *The Ambiguity of Play*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1997.

Swirski, Peter. "Literary Studies and Literary Pragmatics: The Case of the "Purloined Letter"." *SubStance* 25.3.81 (1996): 69-89.

Tedeschi, James T, Barry R. Schlenker, and Thomas V. Bonoma. *Conflict, Power, and Games: The Experimental Study of Interpersonal Relationships*. Chicago: Aldine, 1973.

- Tudorica Impey, Olga. "La poesía y la prosa del *Siervo libre de amor*: ¿aferramiento a la tradición del *prosimetrum* y de la convención lírica?" *Medieval, Renaissance and Folklore Studies in Honor of John Esten Keller*. Ed. Joseph R. Jones. Newark: Juan de la Cuesta, 1980. 171-87.
- . "The Literary Emancipation of Juan Rodríguez del Padrón: From the Fictional "Cartas" to the *Siervo libre de amor*." *Speculum* 55.2 (1980): 305-316.
- Turner, Victor. *Celebration: Studies in Festivity and Ritual*. Victor Turner, ed. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1982.
- . *From Ritual to Theatre: The Human Seriousness of Play*. New York: Performing Arts Journal Publications, 1982.
- . "Liminal to Liminoid in play, flow and ritual: An Essay in Comparative Symbolology." *Rice University Studies* 60 (1974): 53-92.
- . "Social Dramas and Ritual Metaphors." *Ritual, Play, and Performance: Readings in The Social Sciences/Theatre*. Ed. Richard Schechner and Mady Schuman. New York: The Seabury Press, 1976. 97-122.
- Wardropper, Bruce. "El mundo sentimental en *Cárcel de amor*." *Revista de filología española* 37 (1954): 168-193.

Weiss, Julian. "Álvaro de Luna, Juan de Mena, and the Power of Courtly Love." *MLN* 106 (1991): 241-56.

---. *The Poet's Art: Literary Theory in Castile c. 1400-60*. Oxford: The Society for the Study of Medieval Languages and Literature, 1990.

Weissberger, Barbara. *Isabel Rules: Constructing Queenship, Wielding Power*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2004.

---. "Role-Reversal and Festivity in the Romances of Juan de Flores." *Journal of Hispanic Philology* 13.3 (1989): 197-213.

---. "The Critics and Florencia Pinar: The Problem with Assigning Feminism to a Medieval Court Poet." *Recovering Spain's Feminist Tradition*. Ed. Lisa Vollendorf. New York: The MLA of America, 2001. 31-47.

---. "The Gendered Taxonomy of Spanish Romance." *La corónica* 29.1 (2000): 205-229.

---. "The Politics of *Cárcel de Amor*." *Revista de estudios hispánicos* 26.3 (1992): 307-326.

Wollock, Jennifer G. *Rethinking Chivalry and Courtly Love*. Santa Barbara: Praeger, 2011.